arXiv:0911.3466v1 [math.RA] 18 Nov 2009

Finite dimensional special odd contact superalgebras over a field of prime characteristic

WENDE LIU[1,2,*] AND JIXIA YUAN[1,†]

[1]*Department of Mathematics, Harbin Institute of Technology*
Harbin 150006, China

[2]*School of Mathematical Sciences, Harbin Normal University*
Harbin 150025, China

Abstract This paper considers a family of finite dimensional simple Lie superalgebras of Cartan type over a field of characteristic $p > 3$, the so-called special odd contact superalgebras. First, the spanning sets are determined for the Lie superalgebras and their relatives. Second, the spanning sets are used to characterize the simplicity and to compute the dimension formulas. Third, we determine the superderivation algebras and the first cohomology groups. Finally, the dimension formulas and the first cohomology groups are used to make a comparison between the special odd contact superalgebras and the other simple Lie superalgebras of Cartan type.

Keywords: Superderivations, spanning sets, first cohomology

MSC 2000: 17B40, 17B50, 17B70

0. Introduction

The theory of Lie superalgebras has seen a significant development. For example, V. G. Kac classified the finite dimensional simple Lie superalgebras and the infinite dimensional simple linearly compact Lie superalgebras over algebraically closed fields of characteristic zero (see [4, 5, 11]). But there are not so plentiful results for modular Lie superalgebras (that is, Lie superalgebras over fields of prime characteristic). The classification problem is still open for finite dimensional simple modular Lie superalgebras (see [1, 15] for example). As far as we know, [6, 10] should be two of the earliest papers on modular Lie superalgebras. Recently, certain new simple Lie superalgebras over a field of characteristic 3 were constructed and studied [1, 2]. In [3, 9, 15] six families of finite dimensional modular Lie superalgebras of Cartan type W, S, H, K, HO and KO were considered and the simplicity and restrictiveness were determined. The superderivation algebras have been sufficiently studied for these Lie superalgebras [8, 9, 14, 16]. In a recent paper [7], the finite dimensional special odd

---

[*] Supported by the NSF of China (10871057) and the NSF of Heilongjiang Province (A200802)

[†] Correspondence: jxy@hrbnu.edu.cn (J. Yuan); wendeliu@ustc.edu.cn (W. Liu)

Hamiltonian superalgebras were introduced and the spanning set, simplicity and dimension formula were determined.

In the present paper, motivated by [5, 7], we study a family of finite dimensional Lie superalgebras of Cartan type over a filed of characteristic $p > 3$, the special odd contact superalgebras, and determine the spanning sets, simplicity, dimension formulas, the superderivations and the first cohomology. From the discussions and certain conclusions in this paper one may see that, as in the non-modular case, the special odd contact superalgebras possess more complicated structures and have no analogous in the finite dimensional modular Lie algebras of Cartan type (cf. [12, 13]).

1. Preliminaries

Throughout $\mathbb{F}$ is a field of characteristic $p > 3$; $\mathbb{Z}_2 := \{\bar{0}, \bar{1}\}$ is the additive group of two elements; $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0$ are the sets of positive integers and nonnegative integers, respectively. Fix an integer $n \geq 3$ and an n-tuple $\underline{t} := (t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Put $\pi := (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n)$, where $\pi_i := p^{t_i} - 1$ for $i \in \overline{1, n}$. Let $\mathcal{O}(n; \underline{t})$ be the divided power algebra with $\mathbb{F}$-basis $\{x^{(\alpha)} \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{A}(n; \underline{t})\}$, where $\mathbb{A}(n; \underline{t}) := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \mid \alpha_i \leq \pi_i\}$. Note that $x^{(0)} := 1 \in \mathcal{O}(n; \underline{t})$, where $0 = (0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{A}(n; \underline{t})$. For $\varepsilon_i := (\delta_{i1}, \delta_{i2}, \ldots, \delta_{in}) \in \mathbb{A}(n; \underline{t})$, write x_i for $x^{(\varepsilon_i)}$, where $i = \overline{1, n}$. Let $\Lambda(m)$ be the exterior superalgebra over $\mathbb{F}$ in m variables $x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \ldots, x_{n+m}$. Set

$$\mathbb{B}(m) := \left\{\langle i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k \rangle \mid n + 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \leq n + m;\ k \in \overline{0, m}\right\}.$$

For $u := \langle i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k \rangle \in \mathbb{B}(m)$, write $|u| := k$ $x^u := x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_k}$, and denote by u itself the index set $\{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k\}$. For $u, v \in \mathbb{B}(m)$ with $u \cap v = \emptyset$, write $u + v$ for the uniquely determined element $w \in \mathbb{B}(m)$ such that $w = u \cup v$. If $v \subset u$, write $u - v$ for the uniquely determined element $w \in \mathbb{B}(m)$ such that $w = u \setminus v$. Clearly, the associative superalgebra

$$\mathcal{O}(n, m; \underline{t}) := \mathcal{O}(n; \underline{t}) \otimes \Lambda(m)$$

has a so-called *standard* $\mathbb{F}$-*basis*

$$\{x^{(\alpha)} \otimes x^u \mid (\alpha, u) \in \mathbb{A}(n; \underline{t}) \times \mathbb{B}(m)\}.$$

Let ∂_r be the superderivation of $\mathcal{O}(n, m; \underline{t})$ defined by $\partial_r(x^{(\alpha)}) = x^{(\alpha - \varepsilon_r)}$ for $r \in \overline{1, n}$ and $\partial_r(x_s) = \delta_{rs}$ for $r, s \in \overline{1, n + m}$. The *generalized Witt superalgebra* $W(n, m; \underline{t})$ is $\mathbb{F}$-spanned by $\{f_r \partial_r \mid f_r \in \mathcal{O}(n, m; \underline{t}), r \in \overline{1, n + m}\}$. Note that $W(n, m; \underline{t})$ is a free $\mathcal{O}(n, m; \underline{t})$-module with basis $\{\partial_r \mid r \in \overline{1, n + m}\}$. In particular, $W(n, m; \underline{t})$ has a *standard* $\mathbb{F}$-*basis*

$$\{x^{(\alpha)} x^u \partial_r \mid (\alpha, u, r) \in \mathbb{A}(n; \underline{t}) \times \mathbb{B}(m) \times \overline{1, n + m}\}.$$

For an n-tuple $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, put $|\alpha| := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$. The associative algebra $\mathcal{O}(n, m; \underline{t})$ has a standard $\mathbb{Z}$-grading structure $\mathcal{O}(n, m; \underline{t}) = \oplus_{i=0}^{\xi} \mathcal{O}(n, m; \underline{t})_i$, where

$$\mathcal{O}(n, m; \underline{t})_i := \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{x^{(\alpha)} x^u \mid |\alpha| + |u| = i\}, \quad \xi := |\pi| + m.$$

For a vector superspace $V = V_{\bar{0}} \oplus V_{\bar{1}}$, we write $\mathrm{p}(x) := \theta$ for the *parity* of a homogeneous element $x \in V_\theta$, $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. Once the symbol $\mathrm{p}(x)$ appears in this paper, it will imply that x is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-homogeneous element.

When $m = n + 1$, we write $\mathcal{O} := \mathcal{O}(n, n + 1; \underline{t})$. Recall the odd contact superalgebra, which is a simple Lie superalgebra contained in $W(n, n+1; \underline{t})$, defined as follows (see [3, 5]):

$$KO(n, n + 1; \underline{t}) := \{D_{KO}(a) \mid a \in \mathcal{O}\},$$

where

$$D_{KO}(a) := T_H(a) + (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(a)}\partial_{2n+1}(a)\mathfrak{D} + (\mathfrak{D}(a) - 2a)\partial_{2n+1}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{D} := \sum_{i=1}^{2n} x_i\partial_i, \quad T_H(a) := \sum_{i=1}^{2n}(-1)^{\mu(i')\mathrm{p}(a)}\partial_{i'}(a)\partial_i,$$

$$i' := \begin{cases} i+n, & \text{if } i \in \overline{1,n} \\ i-n, & \text{if } i \in \overline{n+1,2n}, \end{cases} \qquad \mu(i) := \begin{cases} \bar{0}, & \text{if } i \in \overline{1,n} \\ \bar{1}, & \text{if } i \in \overline{n+1,2n+1}. \end{cases}$$

Note that for $a, b \in \mathcal{O}$,

$$[D_{KO}(a), D_{KO}(b)] = D_{KO}(D_{KO}(a)(b) - (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(a)}2\partial_{2n+1}(a)b) \tag{1.1}$$

(see [3, 5]). Given $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$, put

$$SKO''(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t}) := \{D_{KO}(a) \mid \mathrm{div}_\lambda(a) = 0, a \in \mathcal{O}\},$$

where

$$\mathrm{div}_\lambda(a) := (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(a)}2(\Delta(a) + (\mathfrak{D} - n\lambda\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}})\partial_{2n+1}(a))$$

and

$$\Delta := \sum_{i=1}^{n}\partial_i\partial_{i'}.$$

Then one can verify that $SKO''(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t})$ is a subalgebra of $KO(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t})$ (c.f. [5]). The following symbols will be frequently used in this paper:

$$\Delta_i := \partial_i\partial_{i'}; \nabla_i(x^{(\alpha)}x^u) := x^{(\alpha+\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}x^u; \Gamma_i^j := \nabla_j\Delta_i \quad \text{for } i, j \in \overline{1,n},$$

for fixed $(\alpha, u) \in \mathbb{A}(n; \underline{t}) \times \mathbb{B}(n+1)$,

$$I(x^{(\alpha)}x^u) := I(\alpha, u) := \{i \in \overline{1,n} \mid \Delta_i(x^{(\alpha)}x^u) \neq 0\};$$

$$\widetilde{I}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u) := \widetilde{I}(\alpha, u) := \{i \in \overline{1,n} \mid \nabla_i(x^{(\alpha)}x^u) \neq 0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}^* := \{x^{(\alpha)}x^u \in \mathcal{O} \mid I(\alpha, u) \neq \emptyset, \widetilde{I}(\alpha, u) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Recall some Lie superalgebras contained in $W(n, n; \underline{t})$:

$$\begin{aligned} SHO'(n, n; \underline{t}) &:= \{T_H(a) \mid a \in \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t}), \Delta(a) = 0\}; \\ \overline{SHO}(n, n; t) &:= [SHO'(n, n; t), SHO'(n, n; t)]. \end{aligned}$$

It was proven in [7] that

$$\overline{SHO}(n, n; t) = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\big(\{T_H\big(x^{(\alpha)}x^u\big) \mid I(\alpha, u) = \emptyset, \widetilde{I}(\alpha, u) \neq \emptyset\} \cup \mathcal{G}\big), \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$\mathcal{G} := \Big\{T_H\Big(x^{(\alpha)}x^u - \sum_{i \in I(\alpha,u)}\Gamma_i^q(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)\Big) \mid x^{(\alpha)}x^u \in \mathcal{D}^*, q \in \widetilde{I}(\alpha, u)\Big\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{K}(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t})$ be the subspace spanned by the elements $D_{KO}(a)$, where $a \in \oplus_{i\geq 1}\mathcal{O}_i$ such that

$$\mathrm{div}_\lambda(a) = 0, \ \partial_{2n+1}(a) = 0. \tag{1.3}$$

If $\partial_{2n+1}(a)=\partial_{2n+1}(b)=0$, that is, $a,b\in\mathcal{O}(n,n;\underline{t})$, then by (1.1), we have

$$[D_{KO}(a),D_{KO}(b)]=D_{KO}(T_H(a)(b)).$$

Note that

$$[T_H(a),T_H(b)]=T_H(T_H(a)(b)).$$

It follows that $\mathcal{K}(n,n{+}1;\lambda,\underline{t})$ is a subalgebra of $SKO'(n,n{+}1;\lambda,\underline{t})$. Moreover, the mapping

$$\rho:\mathcal{K}(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t})\longrightarrow SHO'(n,n;\underline{t}),\quad D_{KO}(a)\longmapsto T_H(a) \tag{1.4}$$

is an isomorphism of Lie superalgebras. In this paper we mainly study the following derived superalgebras

$$SKO'(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t}):=[SKO''(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t}),SKO''(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t})],$$

$$SKO(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t}):=[SKO'(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t}),SKO'(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t})],$$

called the *special odd contact (Lie) superalgebras*. For simplicity, in the following sections we shall write $\mathfrak{g}$ for SKO and usually omit the parameters $(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t})$.

2. Spanning sets

From now on, we take the convention that the expression $x^{(\alpha)}x^u$ implies that $\alpha\in\mathbb{A}(n;\underline{t})$ and $u\in\mathbb{B}(n)$. For $f\in\mathcal{O}$, if there is $i\in\overline{1,n}$ such that $\nabla_i(f)\neq 0$, then f is called *i-integral*. If $\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\neq\emptyset$, we write $q_{(\alpha,u)}:=\min\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)$. Recall our convention that $n\geq 3$. To formulate the linear generators of $\mathfrak{g}''$ (Theorem 2.1), we introduce the following symbols for $q\in\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&A(\alpha,u,q):=x^{(\alpha)}x^u-\sum_{i\in I(\alpha,u)}\Gamma_i^q(x^{(\alpha)}x^u),\\
&B(\alpha,u,\lambda,q):=(-1)^{|u|}(n\lambda-\mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u))\nabla_q(x^{(\alpha)}x^u),\\
&E(\alpha,u):=D_{KO}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u),\\
&E(\alpha,u,q):=D_{KO}\big(A(\alpha,u,q)\big),\\
&E(\alpha,u,2n+1):=D_{KO}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u x_{2n+1}),\\
&E(\alpha,u,2n+1,q):=D_{KO}\big(x^{(\alpha)}x^u x_{2n+1}+B(\alpha,u,\lambda,q)\big),\\
&G(\alpha,u,2n+1,q):=D_{KO}\big(A(\alpha,u,q)x_{2n+1}+B(\alpha,u,\lambda,q)\big)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_1:=\{E(\alpha,u)\mid I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset,(\alpha,u)\neq(0,0)\},\\
&S_2:=\{E(\alpha,u,q)\mid x^{(\alpha)}x^u\in\mathcal{D}^*,q\in\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\},\\
&S_3:=\{E(\alpha,u,2n+1,q(\alpha,u))\mid I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset,\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\neq\emptyset\},\\
&S_4:=\{G(\alpha,u,2n+1,q)\mid x^{(\alpha)}x^u\in\mathcal{D}^*,q\in\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\},\\
&S_5:=\{E(\alpha,u,2n+1)\mid I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset,\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)=\emptyset,n\lambda-\mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)=0\text{ in }\mathbb{F}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

One can easily verify that $\cup_{i=1}^5 S_i\subset\mathfrak{g}''$ and $\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}S_i\cap\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}(\cup_{j\neq i}S_j)=0$.

In the following, we use frequently a decomposition: Given $j \in \overline{n+1, 2n+1}$ any element $f \in \mathcal{O}$ can be uniquely written as

$$f = f_0 x_j + f_1 \quad \text{where} \quad \partial_j(f_0) = \partial_j(f_1) = 0,$$

called the x_j-*decomposition* of f. The x_{2n+1}-decomposition of $f \in \mathcal{O}$ is

$$f = f_0 x_{2n+1} + f_1 \quad \text{where} \quad \partial_{2n+1}(f_0) = \partial_{2n+1}(f_1) = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Theorem 2.1. *$\mathfrak{g}''$ is spanned by $\{D_{KO}(1)\}$ and $\cup_{i=1}^{5} S_i$.*

Proof. Let $D_{KO}(f)$ be an arbitrary element of $\mathfrak{g}''$, where $f \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $\mathrm{div}_\lambda(f) = 0$. We want to show that $D_{KO}(f)$ is a linear combination of $\{D_{KO}(1)\}$ and $\cup_{i=1}^{5} S_i$. Consider the x_{2n+1}-decomposition (2.1) of f. We have

$$2(-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f)}\big(\Delta(f_0)x_{2n+1} + \Delta(f_1) + (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(\mathfrak{D} - n\lambda\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}})(f_0)\big) = \mathrm{div}_\lambda(f) = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\Delta(f_0) = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\Delta(f_1) = (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}} - \mathfrak{D})(f_0). \tag{2.3}$$

From (2.2) one sees that $f_0 \in \mathbb{F}$ or $D_{KO}(f_0) \in \mathcal{K}(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t})$. From (1.4) we know that $\mathcal{K}(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t}) \cong SHO'(n, n; \underline{t})$. Then by [7, Theorem 2.7], $\mathcal{K}(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t})$ is spanned by $S_1 \cup S_2$. Thus, we can suppose

$$f_0 = \sum_{I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset} a_{(\alpha,u)} x^{(\alpha)} x^u + \sum_{x^{(\alpha)}x^u \in \mathcal{D}^*, q \in \widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)} a_{(\alpha,u)} A(\alpha, u, q), \tag{2.4}$$

where $a_{(\alpha,u)} \in \mathbb{F}$.

Suppose $n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u) \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{F}$ for some α, u with $I(\alpha, u) = \emptyset$ and $\widetilde{I}(\alpha, u) = \emptyset$. It follows from (2.3) that $a_{(\alpha,u)} = 0$. Thus (2.4) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 \quad = \quad & \sum_{\substack{I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset, \widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)=\emptyset \\ n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)=0}} a_{(\alpha,u)} x^{(\alpha)} x^u + \sum_{I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset, \widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\neq\emptyset} a_{(\alpha,u)} x^{(\alpha)} x^u \\ & + \sum_{x^{(\alpha)}x^u \in \mathcal{D}^*, q \in \widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)} a_{(\alpha,u)} A(\alpha, u, q). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} g \quad := \quad & f_1 - \sum_{I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset, \widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\neq\emptyset} a_{(\alpha,u)} B(\alpha, u, \lambda, q(\alpha, u)) \\ & - \sum_{x^{(\alpha)}x^u \in \mathcal{D}^*, q \in \widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)} a_{(\alpha,u)} B(\alpha, u, \lambda, q). \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(f_1) \quad = \quad & \Delta(g) + \Delta\Big(\sum_{I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset, \widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\neq\emptyset} a_{(\alpha,u)} B(\alpha, u, \lambda, q(\alpha, u)) \\ & + \sum_{x^{(\alpha)}x^u \in \mathcal{D}^*, q \in \widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)} a_{(\alpha,u)} B(\alpha, u, \lambda, q)\Big) \\ = \quad & \Delta(g) + (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}} - \mathfrak{D})(f_0). \end{aligned}$$

Then by (2.3), we have $\Delta(g)=0$. Hence $g\in\mathbb{F}$ or $D_{KO}(g)\in\mathcal{K}(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t})$. Consequently,

$$D_{KO}(g)\in\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_1\cup S_2\cup\{D_{KO}(1)\}). \tag{2.7}$$

From (2.5) and (2.6) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
f &= f_0x_{2n+1}+f_1\\
&= f_0x_{2n+1}+\sum_{I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset,\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\neq\emptyset} a_{(\alpha,u)}B(\alpha,u,\lambda,q(\alpha,u))\\
&\quad+\sum_{x^{(\alpha)}x^u\in\mathcal{D}^*,q\in\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)} a_{(\alpha,u)}B(\alpha,u,\lambda,q)+g\\
&= \sum_{\substack{I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset,\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)=\emptyset\\ n\lambda-\mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)=0}} a_{(\alpha,u)}x^{(\alpha)}x^ux_{2n+1}+\sum_{I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset,\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\neq\emptyset} a_{(\alpha,u)}(x^{(\alpha)}x^ux_{2n+1}\\
&\quad+B(\alpha,u,\lambda,q(\alpha,u)))+\sum_{x^{(\alpha)}x^u\in\mathcal{D}^*,q\in\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)} a_{(\alpha,u)}(A(\alpha,u,q)x_{2n+1}\\
&\quad+B(\alpha,u,\lambda,q))+g\\
&= \sum_{\substack{I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset,\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)=\emptyset\\ n\lambda-\mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)=0}} a_{(\alpha,u)}E(\alpha,u,2n+1)+\sum_{I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset,\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\neq\emptyset} a_{(\alpha,u)}E(\alpha,u,2n+1,q(\alpha,u))\\
&\quad+\sum_{x^{(\alpha)}x^u\in\mathcal{D}^*,q\in\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)} a_{(\alpha,u)}G(\alpha,u,2n+1,q)+g.
\end{aligned}$$

This combining (2.7) shows that

$$D_{KO}(f)\,\text{is a linear combination of}\ \cup_{i=1}^{5}S_i\cup\{D_{KO}(1)\}.$$

□

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose $D_{KO}(f)\in\mathfrak{g}''$ and $f=f_0x_{2n+1}+f_1$ is the x_{2n+1}-decomposition. Then $[D_{KO}(f),D_{KO}(1)]=2D_{KO}(f_0)$.*

Proof. Using (1.1), one may directly compute. □

Lemma 2.3. *If $D_{KO}(f)\in[\mathcal{K}(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t}),\mathcal{K}(n,n+1;\lambda,\underline{t})]$, then f does not contain any nonzero monomials of the form $x^{(\alpha)}x^u$ such that $I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset$, $\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)=\emptyset$.*

Proof. Write $D_{KO}(f)=[D_{KO}(g),D_{KO}(h)]$, where g,h satisfy the conditions (1.3). Then by (1.4),

$$T_H(f)=[T_H(g),T_H(h)]$$

and the conclusion follows from [7, Proposition 3.4]. □

Put

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{A}_1&:=\{x^{(\alpha)}x^u\mid I(\alpha,u)=\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)=\emptyset\},\\
\mathfrak{A}_2&:=\{x^{(\alpha)}x^u\mid I(\alpha,u)=\emptyset,\widetilde{I}(\alpha,u)\neq\emptyset\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$x^{(\alpha)}x^u\in\mathfrak{A}_1\Longleftrightarrow\alpha_i=\pi_i\ \text{or}\ 0\ \text{for all}\ i\in\overline{1,n}\ \text{and}\ u=\{j'\mid\alpha_j=0,j\in\overline{1,n}\}. \tag{2.8}$$

It is clear that

$$S_1 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\} = \{D_{KO}(f) \mid f \in \mathfrak{A}_1\} \cup \{D_{KO}(f) \mid f \in \mathfrak{A}_2\}.$$

Given $r \in \overline{1, n}$, let

$$\mathbf{J}(0) := \emptyset,$$

$$\mathbf{J}(r) := \{(i_1, \ldots, i_r) \mid 1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq n\}.$$

For $(i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in \mathbf{J}(r)$, $r \in \overline{0, n}$, let

$$X(i_1, \ldots, i_r) := x^{(\pi_{i_1}\varepsilon_{i_1} + \cdots + \pi_{i_r}\varepsilon_{i_r})} x^{\langle 1', \ldots, n' \rangle - \langle i'_1, \ldots, i'_r \rangle}.$$

We list some technical formulas, which will be used later. Suppose $I(\alpha^1, u^1) = \emptyset$, $I(\alpha^2, u^2) = \emptyset$, $\alpha^1 + \alpha^2 = \alpha$, $u^1 + u^2 = u$, $q \in \widetilde{I}(\alpha, u)$. Then

$$[E(\alpha^1, u^1, 2n+1, q), E(\alpha^2, u^2, 2n+1, q)] = \begin{cases} \gamma E(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) & \text{if } I(\alpha, u) = \emptyset \\ \gamma G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) & \text{if } I(\alpha, u) \neq \emptyset, \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma : \quad = \quad & \pm\Big[(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(\alpha^2, u^2))\binom{\alpha}{\alpha^1 - \varepsilon_q} + (\mathrm{zd}(\alpha^1, u^1) - \mathrm{zd}(\alpha^2, u^2))\binom{\alpha}{\alpha^1} \\ & -(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(\alpha^1, u^1))\binom{\alpha}{\alpha^1 + \varepsilon_q}\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $f \in \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})$ is q-integral, where $q \in \overline{1, n}$. Put

$$Y(f, q) := D_{KO}(f x_{2n+1} + (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))\nabla_q(f_0)).$$

In the sequel, once the symbol $Y(f, q)$ appears, it will impliy that $f \in \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})$ is q-integral.

NOTICE that in Lemmas 2.4, 2.5, Theorems 2.6 and 2.7 we will always assume that $D_{KO}(f_0)$, $D_{KO}(g_0) \in S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\}$.

Lemma 2.4. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} & [Y(f_0, q), D_{KO}(g_0)] \\ = \quad & D_{KO}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{2n}(-1)^{\mu(i')\mathrm{p}(f_0 x_{2n+1})}\partial_{i'}(f_0 x_{2n+1})\partial_i(g_0) + (2 - \mathrm{zd}(g_0))f_0 g_0 \\ & +(-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))\sum_{i=1}^{2n}(-1)^{\mu(i')\mathrm{p}(\nabla_q(f_0))}\partial_{i'}(\nabla_q(f_0))\partial_i(g_0)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& [Y(f_0,q),Y(g_0,r)] \\
= \; & D_{KO}\Big((-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)+\mathrm{p}(g_0)}(n\lambda-\mathrm{zd}(f_0))(\mathrm{zd}(\nabla_q(f_0))-2)\nabla_q(f_0)g_0 \\
& +(-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)+\mathrm{p}(g_0)}(n\lambda-\mathrm{zd}(f_0))(n\lambda-\mathrm{zd}(g_0))\sum_{i=1}^{2n}(-1)^{\mu(i)\mathrm{p}(\nabla_q(f_0))}\partial_{i'}(\nabla_q(f_0))\partial_i(\nabla_r(g_0)) \\
& +(-1)^{\mathrm{p}(g_0)}(n\lambda-\mathrm{zd}(g_0))\sum_{i=1}^{2n}(-1)^{\mu(i')\mathrm{p}(f_0x_{2n+1})}\partial_{i'}(f_0x_{2n+1})\partial_i(\nabla_r(g_0)) \\
& +(-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda-\mathrm{zd}(f_0))\sum_{i=1}^{2n}(-1)^{\mu(i')\mathrm{p}(\nabla_q(f_0))}\partial_{i'}(\nabla_q(f_0))\partial_i(g_0x_{2n+1}) \\
& +(-1)^{\mathrm{p}(g_0)}(n\lambda-\mathrm{zd}(g_0))(2+\mathrm{zd}(\nabla_r(g_0)))f_0\nabla_r(g_0) \\
& +(\mathrm{zd}(f_0)-\mathrm{zd}(g_0))f_0g_0x_{2n+1}\Big). \qquad (2.11)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using (1.1), one can directly compute. ☐

Given $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, put

$$\mathfrak{S}_l(\lambda,n) := \{k \in \overline{0,n} \mid n\lambda - n + 2k + l = 0 \in \mathbb{F}\},$$

the set of all the integer solutions between 0 and n of the equation that $n\lambda - n + 2x + l = 0$ in $\mathbb{F}$. Put

$$G := G(\pi - \varepsilon_1, \langle 2', \ldots, n' \rangle, 2n+1, 1).$$

Lemma 2.5. *If* $[Y(f_0,l),Y(g_0,r)] = sG$ *for some* $0 \neq s \in \mathbb{F}$, *then there is* $k \in \overline{1,n}$ *such that* f_0 *and* g_0 *are* k*-integral.*

Proof. If there exists no such k, then

$$\nabla_k(f_0g_0) = \nabla_k(\partial_{i'}(f_0)\partial_i(\nabla_r(g_0))) = \nabla_k(\partial_{i'}(\nabla_l(f_0))\partial_i(g_0)) = 0$$

for all $k \in \overline{1,n}$. Since $[Y(f_0,l),Y(g_0,r)] = sG$, it follows that

$$f_0g_0 = \partial_{i'}(f_0)\partial_i(\nabla_r(g_0)) = \partial_{i'}(\nabla_l(f_0))\partial_i(g_0) = 0.$$

Then by (2.11) we have $s = 0$. This contradicts the assumption that $s \neq 0$. The proof is complete. ☐

Theorem 2.6. *If* $n\lambda + 1 \neq 0$ *in* $\mathbb{F}$ *or* $\mathfrak{S}_0(n,\lambda) \neq \emptyset$, *then*

$$\mathfrak{g}'' = \mathfrak{g}' \oplus \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}} S_5 \oplus \sum_{\substack{r\in\mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda,n)\\(i_1,\ldots,i_r)\in\mathbf{J}(r)}} \mathbb{F}D_{KO}(X(i_1,\ldots,i_r)).$$

If $n\lambda + 1 = 0$ *in* $\mathbb{F}$ *and* $\mathfrak{S}_0(n,\lambda) = \emptyset$, *then*

$$\mathfrak{g}'' = \mathfrak{g}' \oplus \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}} S_5 \oplus \sum_{\substack{r\in\mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda,n)\\(i_1,\ldots,i_r)\in\mathbf{J}(r)}} \mathbb{F}D_{KO}(X(i_1,\ldots,i_r)) \oplus \mathbb{F}G.$$

Proof. In the light of Theorem 2.1, our discussion is divided into six parts.

Part 1. Assert that $\{D_{KO}(f) \mid f \in \mathfrak{A}_2\} \cup S_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{g}'$. This follows from Lemma 2.2.

Part 2. Assert that $S_3 \subseteq \mathfrak{g}'$. Consider the elements in S_3, say, $E(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q(\alpha, u))$. Take $q \neq q'_{(\alpha,u)}$. Since

$$E(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q_{(\alpha,u)}) \equiv [E(\alpha + \varepsilon_{q_{(\alpha,u)}}, u), E(0, q'_{(\alpha,u)}, 2n+1, q)] \pmod{S_2},$$

we have $E(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q_{(\alpha,u)}) \in \mathfrak{g}'$. Thus, $S_3 \subseteq \mathfrak{g}'$.

Part 3. Assert that $S_4 \setminus \{\pm G\} \subseteq \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\}) \subseteq \mathfrak{g}'$. Consider $G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) \in S_4$. Suppose $I(\alpha, u) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \neq \emptyset$ and $u = \{i'_1, \ldots, i'_k, i'_{k+1}, \ldots, i'_r\} \neq \emptyset$. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
(\alpha^1, u^1) &:= (\alpha_{i_1}\varepsilon_{i_1} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_k}\varepsilon_{i_k}, \langle i'_{k+1}, \ldots, i'_r\rangle);\\
(\alpha^2, u^2) &:= (\alpha - \alpha^1, u - u^1);\\
(\alpha^3, u^3) &:= (\alpha_{i_2}\varepsilon_{i_2} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_k}\varepsilon_{i_k}, \langle i'_1, i'_{k+1}, \ldots, i'_r\rangle);\\
(\alpha^4, u^4) &:= (\alpha - \alpha^3, u - u^3).
\end{aligned}$$

By (2.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& [E(\alpha^1, u^1, 2n+1, q), E(\alpha^2, u^2, 2n+1, q)]\\
= \ & \big(n\lambda\alpha_q - (\alpha_q + 1)\mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^2)}x^{u^2}) + \mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^1)}x^{u^1})\big)G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) \qquad (2.12)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& [E(\alpha^3, u^3, 2n+1, q), E(\alpha^4, u^4, 2n+1, q)]\\
= \ & \big(n\lambda\alpha_q - (\alpha_q + 1)\mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^4)}x^{u^4}) + \mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^3)}x^{u^3})\big)G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q). \qquad (2.13)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\alpha_q + 2)(\alpha_{i_1} - 1) \ = \ & \big(n\lambda\alpha_q - (\alpha_q + 1)\mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^2)}x^{u^2}) + \mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^1)}x^{u^1})\big)\\
& -\big(n\lambda\alpha_q - (\alpha_q + 1)\mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^4)}x^{u^4}) + \mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^3)}x^{u^3})\big). \qquad (2.14)
\end{aligned}$$

Let us show the assertion in Part 3.

Subpart 3.1. Assert that $G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\})$ if $\alpha_q \not\equiv -2 \pmod p$ and $\alpha_{i_1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod p$. From (2.14) we know that

$$n\lambda\alpha_q - (\alpha_q + 1)\mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^2)}x^{u^2}) + \mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^1)}x^{u^1})$$

and

$$n\lambda\alpha_q - (\alpha_q + 1)\mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^4)}x^{u^4}) + \mathrm{zd}(x^{(\alpha^3)}x^{u^3})$$

cannot be all zero in $\mathbb{F}$. By (2.12) and (2.13), we have

$$G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\}).$$

Subpart 3.2. If $\alpha_q \not\equiv -2 \pmod p$ and $\alpha_{i_1} \equiv 1 \pmod p$, then by Subpart 3.1,

$$G(\alpha + \varepsilon_{i_1}, u, 2n+1, q) \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\}).$$

Since $E(0, i'_1) \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\})$, we have

$$G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) = [G(\alpha + \varepsilon_{i_1}, u, 2n+1, q), E(0, i'_1)] \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\}).$$

Subpart 3.3. If $\alpha_q \equiv -2 \pmod p$ and $-2n\lambda + \mathrm{zd}(\alpha, u) \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{F}$, then by (2.9) , we have

$$G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\}).$$

Subpart 3.4. If $\alpha_q \equiv -2 \pmod p$ and $-2n\lambda + \mathrm{zd}(\alpha, u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{F}$ and $G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) \neq \pm G$, then there is $i \in \overline{1, n}$ such that

$$G(\alpha + \varepsilon_i, u, 2n+1, q) \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\})$$

or

$$G(\alpha, u + \langle i' \rangle, 2n+1, q) \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\}).$$

Since $E(\varepsilon_i, 0), E(0, i') \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\})$, we have

$$G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) \equiv [G(\alpha + \varepsilon_i, u, 2n+1, q), E(0, i')] \pmod{\mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\})}$$

or

$$G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) \equiv [G(\alpha, u + \langle i' \rangle, 2n+1, q), E(i, 0)] \pmod{\mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\})}.$$

Therefore, $G(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q) \in \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\})$. It follows from Subparts 3.1–3.4 that $S_4 \setminus \{\pm G\} \subseteq \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3 \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\})$.

Part 4. Assert that $G \in \mathfrak{g}' \Longleftrightarrow n\lambda + 1 \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{F}$ or $\mathfrak{S}_0(n, \lambda) \neq \emptyset$. Note that

$$-2(n\lambda + 1)G = [E(\pi - \varepsilon_1, 0, 2n+1, 1), E(0, \langle 2', \ldots, n' \rangle, 2n+1, 1)] \in \mathfrak{g}'. \tag{2.15}$$

If $n\lambda + 1 \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{F}$, then $G \in \mathfrak{g}'$. If $\mathfrak{S}_0(n, \lambda) \neq \emptyset$, then for $r \in \mathfrak{S}_0(n, \lambda)$ we have

$$E(\pi_1 + \cdots + \pi_r, \langle (r+1)', \ldots, n', \rangle, 2n+1) \in \mathfrak{g}''.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^{(n-r+1)(r-1)}G \\ = \; & [E(\pi_1 + \cdots + \pi_r, \langle (r+1)', \ldots, n', \rangle, 2n+1), E(\pi_{r+1} + \cdots + \pi_n, \langle 1', \ldots, r', \rangle)], \end{aligned}$$

that is, $G \in \mathfrak{g}'$. Conversely, we consider two cases separately:

Case 1. If

$$[Y(f_0, q), D_{KO}(g_0)] = sG,$$

then

$$[D_{KO}(f_0), D_{KO}(g_0)] = sE(\pi - \varepsilon_1, \langle 2', \ldots, n' \rangle, 1),$$

where $s \in \mathbb{F}$.

Subcase 1.1. Suppose $f_0 = D_{KO}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)$, $g_0 = D_{KO}(x^{(\beta)}x^v)$ with $I(\alpha, u) = I(\beta, v) = \emptyset$ and $\widetilde{I}(\alpha, u) \neq \emptyset$, $\widetilde{I}(\beta, v) = \emptyset$. Note that

$$[D_{KO}(f_0), D_{KO}(g_0)] = \sum_{k=1}^{2n} (-1)^{\mu(k)|u|} \partial_k(x^{(\alpha)}x^u) \partial_{k'}(x^{(\beta)}x^v).$$

Assume that $\partial_i(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)\partial_{i'}(x^{(\beta)}x^v) \neq 0$ for some $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$. By symmetry one may assume that $i \in \overline{1, n}$. Then it is easily seen that $\partial_i(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)\partial_{i'}(x^{(\beta)}x^v)$ is of the form $sx^{(\pi - \varepsilon_i)}x^{\omega - \langle i' \rangle}$. It follows that $\alpha + \beta = \pi$ and $u + v = \omega$ (meaning $u \cap v = \emptyset$). Noticing that $I(\alpha, u) =$

$I(\beta, v) = \emptyset$, one may easily deduce that $\widetilde{I}(\alpha, u) = \emptyset$, contradicting our assumption. This shows that $s = 0$.

Subcase 1.2. Suppose $f_0 = D_{KO}(x^{(\alpha)}x^u - \sum_{i \in I(\alpha,u)} \Gamma_i^q(x^{(\alpha)}x^u))$, $g_0 = D_{KO}(x^{(\beta)}x^v)$ with $I(\alpha, u) \neq \emptyset$, $q \in \widetilde{I}(\alpha, u) \neq \emptyset$, $I(\beta, v) = \emptyset$ and $\widetilde{I}(\beta, v) = \emptyset$. Assume that $s \neq 0$. In the light of [7, Lemma 3.2], there is $k \in \overline{1, 2n}$ such that $\partial_k(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)\partial_{k'}(x^{(\beta)}x^v) \neq 0$. Thus one may assume that $\partial_k(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)\partial_{k'}(x^{(\beta)}x^v)$ is of the form $sx^{(\pi-\varepsilon_k)}x^{\omega-\langle k'\rangle}$. Consequently, we have

$$\alpha + \beta = \pi \quad \text{and} \quad u + v = \omega. \tag{2.16}$$

Note that $I(\beta, v) = \emptyset$ and $\widetilde{I}(\beta, v) = \emptyset$. By (2.8), we know there is $(i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \mathbf{J}(r)$ such that $x^{(\beta)}x^v = X(i_1, \dots, i_r)$. It follows from (2.16) that $x^{(\alpha)}x^u = X(i_{r+1}, \dots, i_n)$. This contradicts the assumption that $I(\alpha, u) \neq \emptyset$, $\widetilde{I}(\alpha, u) \neq \emptyset$.

Now, in combination with [7, Theorem 3.8], one may prove $s = 0$.

Case 2. Suppose $f_0 = x^{(\alpha)}x^u - \sum_{i \in I(\alpha,u)} \Gamma_i^l(x^{(\alpha)}x^u)$, $g_0 = x^{(\beta)}x^v - \sum_{i \in I(\beta,v)} \Gamma_i^r(x^{(\beta)}x^v)$, where $l \in \widetilde{I}(\alpha, u) \neq \emptyset$, $r \in \widetilde{I}(\beta, v) \neq \emptyset$. When $I(\alpha, u) = I(\beta, v) = \emptyset$, one sees that $f_0 = x^{(\alpha)}x^u$ and $g_0 = x^{(\beta)}x^v$. If

$$[Y(f_0, l), Y(g_0, r)] = sG,$$

where $s \in \mathbb{F}$, by Lemma 2.5, there is $k \in \overline{1, n}$ such that f_0 and g_0 be k-integral. By Case 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& [Y(f_0, l), Y(g_0, r)] \\
= \;& [Y(f_0, k) + (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))D_{KO}(\nabla_l(f_0) - \nabla_k(f_0)), \\
& Y(g_0, k) + (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(g_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(g_0))D_{KO}(\nabla_r(g_0) - \nabla_k(g_0))] \\
= \;& [Y(f_0, k), Y(g_0, k)] \\
= \;& sG = \pm sG(\pi - \varepsilon_k, \langle 1', \dots, n' \rangle - \langle k' \rangle, 2n + 1, k).
\end{aligned}$$

Pay attention to the monomials in (2.11) which do not contain x_{2n+1}. Note that $\mathrm{zd}(\alpha, u) + \mathrm{zd}(\beta, v) \equiv -2 \pmod p$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\pm \;& s(n\lambda + 2)x^{(\pi)}x^{\langle 1', \dots, n' \rangle} \\
= \;& (-1)^{|u|+|v|}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(\alpha, u))\mathrm{zd}(\beta, v)x_{k'}x^{(\alpha+\varepsilon_k)}x^u x^{(\beta)}x^v \\
& +(-1)^{|u|+|v|}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(\alpha, u))(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(\beta, v))x_{k'}x^{(\alpha)}x^u x^{(\beta+\varepsilon_k)}x^v \\
& -(-1)^{|u|+|v|}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(\alpha, u))(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(\beta, v))x_{k'}x^{(\alpha+\varepsilon_k)}x^u x^{(\beta)}x^v \\
& +(-1)^{|u|+|v|}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(\beta, v))(4 + \mathrm{zd}(\beta, v))x_{k'}x^{(\alpha)}x^u x^{(\beta+\varepsilon_k)}x^v \\
= \;& \pm 2(n\lambda + 1)(n\lambda + 2)x^{(\pi)}x^{\langle 1', \dots, n' \rangle} \text{ in } \mathbb{F}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $s = \pm 2(n\lambda + 1)$ in $\mathbb{F}$.

Part 5. Assert that for $r \in \overline{0, n}$,

$$D_{KO}(X(i_1, \dots, i_r)) \in \mathfrak{g}' \iff r \notin \mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda, n). \tag{2.17}$$

Subpart 5.1. By Lemma 2.3, if $D_{KO}(h) \in [\mathcal{K}(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t}), \mathcal{K}(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t})]$, where $h \in \mathcal{O}$, then h has no nonzero monomials $X(i_1, \dots, i_r)$.

Subpart 5.2. Pay attention to the monomials in (2.11) which do not contain x_{2n+1}. One sees that if $[Y(f_0, q), Y(g_0, r)]= D_{KO}(h)$, where $h \in \mathcal{O}$, then h has no nonzero monomials $X(i_1, \dots, i_r)$.

Subpart 5.3. If there exist $Y(f_0,q), D_{KO}(g_0)$ such that $[Y(f_0,q), D_{KO}(g_0)] = D_{KO}(h)$, where $h \in \mathcal{O}$ and h has nonzero monomials $X(i_1,\ldots,i_r)$, by (2.10) we have $f_0g_0 = aX(i_1,\ldots,i_r)$, where $0 \neq a \in \mathbb{F}$, and then

$$[Y(f_0,q), D_{KO}(g_0)] = a(n\lambda - n + 2r + 2)X(i_1,\ldots,i_r).$$

The assertion (2.17) follows from Subparts 5.1–5.3.

Part 6. Assert that $\mathfrak{g}' \cap \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}} S_5 = 0$.

Subpart 6.1. Suppose $[Y(f_0,q), Y(g_0,r)] = D_{KO}(h)$ and $h \in \mathcal{O}$ has a nonzero monomial of the form $x^{(\pi_{i_1}\varepsilon_{i_1})}\cdots x^{(\pi_{i_r}\varepsilon_{i_r})}x_{i'_{r+1}}x_{i'_{r+2}}\cdots x_{i'_n}x_{2n+1}$. Then by (2.11), f_0, g_0 must be of the form

$$f_0 = x^{(\alpha)}x^u,\ g_0 = x^{(\beta)}x^\upsilon,$$

where $\alpha + \beta = \pi_{i_1}\varepsilon_{i_1} + \cdots + \pi_{i_r}\varepsilon_{i_r}$, $u + \upsilon = \langle i'_{r+1}\ldots, i'_n\rangle$. In this case,

$$[Y(f_0,q), Y(g_0,r)] = 0.$$

Subpart 6.2. By (2.10), if $[Y(f_0,q), D_{KO}(g_0)] = D_{KO}(h)$ and $h \in \mathcal{O}$ has a nonzero monomial of the form $x^{(\pi_{i_1}\varepsilon_{i_1})}\cdots x^{(\pi_{i_r}\varepsilon_{i_r})}x_{i'_{r+1}}x_{i'_{r+2}}\cdots x_{i'_n}x_{2n+1}$, then there are $0 \neq a \in \mathbb{F}$ and $h_1 \in \mathcal{O}(n,n;\underline{t})$ such that

$$[D_{KO}(f_0), D_{KO}(g_0)] = aD_{KO}(h_1 + X(i_1,\ldots,i_r)).$$

This contradicts Lemma 2.3 and therefore, $\mathfrak{g}' \cap \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}} S_5 = 0$. The proof is complete. □

Put

$$\delta'_{n\lambda,-1} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n\lambda + 1 \neq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{F} \\ 1 & \text{if } n\lambda + 1 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{F}. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 2.7. *$\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{F}\delta'_{n\lambda,-1}G$.*

Proof. (1) By Parts 1–3 in the proof of Theorem 2.6 we have

$$\{D_{KO}(f) \mid f \in \mathfrak{A}_2\} \cup S_2 \cup S_3 \subseteq \mathfrak{g},\ S_4 \setminus \{\pm G\} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}.$$

(2) Since

$$\begin{aligned} & (n\lambda - n + 2r + 2)D_{KO}(X(i_1,\ldots,i_r)) \\ = \quad & [E(\pi_{i_1}\varepsilon_{i_1}, 0, 2n+1, i_2), E(\pi_{i_2}\varepsilon_{i_2} + \cdots + \pi_{i_r}\varepsilon_{i_r}, \langle i'_{r+1},\ldots,i'_n\rangle)], \end{aligned}$$

we have $D_{KO}(X(i_1,\ldots,i_r)) \in \mathfrak{g}$ for all $r \notin \mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda, n)$.

(3) We propose to show that

$$G \in \mathfrak{g} \Longleftrightarrow n\lambda + 1 \neq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{F}.$$

By (2.15), we have $G \in \mathfrak{g}$ when $n\lambda + 1 \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{F}$. The converse follows from Part 4 in the proof of Theorem 2.6. □

For distinct $i, j, k \in \overline{1,n}$ and $q \in \overline{1,n}$, we list some technical formulas, which will be used later:

$$[E(k_i\varepsilon_i, 0, 2n+1, q), E(k_j\varepsilon_j, 0, 2n+1, q)] = (k_i - k_j)E(k_i\varepsilon_i + k_j\varepsilon_j, 0, 2n+1, q), \tag{2.18}$$

$$[E(2\varepsilon_k, 0, 2n+1, q), E(0, \langle i'\rangle, 2n+1, q)] = E(2\varepsilon_k, \langle i'\rangle, 2n+1, q), \tag{2.19}$$

$$[E(2\varepsilon_k, \langle i'\rangle, 2n+1, q), E(0, \langle k'\rangle, 2n+1, q)] = -2G(2\varepsilon_k, \langle k', i'\rangle, 2n+1, q), \tag{2.20}$$

$$[G(2\varepsilon_k, \langle k', i'\rangle, 2n+1, q), E(0, \langle j'\rangle)] = E(2\varepsilon_k, \langle k', i', j'\rangle, q), \tag{2.21}$$

$$[E(2\varepsilon_k, \langle k', i', j'\rangle, q), E(j, 0)] = -E(2\varepsilon_k, \langle k', i'\rangle, q), \tag{2.22}$$

$$[E(2\varepsilon_k, \langle k', i', j'\rangle, q), E(0, \langle k'\rangle)] = E(\varepsilon_k, \langle k', i', j'\rangle, q), \tag{2.23}$$

$$[E(2\varepsilon_k, \langle i'\rangle, 2n+1, q), E(0, \langle k'\rangle)] = E(\varepsilon_k, \langle i'\rangle, 2n+1, q) - E(2\varepsilon_k, \langle k', i'\rangle, q), \tag{2.24}$$

$$[E(\varepsilon_k, \langle i'\rangle, 2n+1, q), E(0, \langle j'\rangle)] = -E(\varepsilon_k, \langle i', j'\rangle), \quad q \neq j, \tag{2.25}$$

$$[E(\varepsilon_k, \langle i', j'\rangle), E(0, \langle k'\rangle, 2n+1, q)] = E(0, \langle i', j'\rangle, 2n+1, q) - E(\varepsilon_k, \langle k', i', j'\rangle, q), \tag{2.26}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & [E(k_i\varepsilon_i + (k_j+1)\varepsilon_j, 0, 2n+1, q), E(0, \langle j'\rangle, 2n+1, q)] \\ = \; & (k_i + k_j)G(k_i\varepsilon_i + (k_j+1)\varepsilon_j, \langle j'\rangle, 2n+1, q), \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & [E(\pi_i\varepsilon_i + (\pi_j - 1)\varepsilon_j, 0, 2n+1, q), E(\varepsilon_j, 0, 2n+1, q)] \\ = \; & \pi_j(\pi_i + \pi_j - 2)E(\pi_i\varepsilon_i + \pi_j\varepsilon_j, 0, 2n+1, q), \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & [E(k_i\varepsilon_i + (k_j+1)\varepsilon_j, 0), E(0, \langle j'\rangle, 2n+1, i)] \\ = \; & E(k_i\varepsilon_i + k_j\varepsilon_j, 0, 2n+1, j) + (k_i+1)(n\lambda - 1)E((k_i+1)\varepsilon_i + k_j\varepsilon_j, \langle i'\rangle, j). \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \{E(k_i\varepsilon_i, 0, 2n+1, q) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 0 \leq k_i \leq p^{t_i} - 1, q \in \widetilde{I}(k_i\varepsilon_i, 0)\}; \\ S &= \{E(0, i', 2n+1, q) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, q \in \widetilde{I}(0, \langle i'\rangle)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $T, S \subseteq S_3$.

Theorem 2.8. *$\mathfrak{g}$ is generated by $T \cup S \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\}$.*

Proof. Let $Y := \mathrm{alg}_{\mathbb{F}}(T \cup S \cup \{D_{KO}(1)\})$. By Theorem 2.6, we may complete the proof by the following four steps.

Step 1. Use induction on the number of variables of $E(\alpha, u, 2n+1, q(\alpha, u)) \in S_3$ to show that $S_3 \subseteq Y$.

Case 1.1. Assert that for distinct $i, j, q \in \overline{1,n}$,

$$E(k_i\varepsilon_i + k_j\varepsilon_j, 0, 2n+1, q) \in Y.$$

If $k_i - k_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$, the conclusion follows from (2.18). If $k_i - k_j \equiv 0 \pmod p$, we consider two cases separately:

Subcase 1.1.1. Suppose $k_i \neq \pi_i$ or $k_j \neq \pi_j$, say, $k_j \neq \pi_j$. From the above, we have

$$E(k_i\varepsilon_i + (k_j+1)\varepsilon_j, 0, 2n+1, q) \in Y.$$

By Lemma 2.2,

$$E(k_i\varepsilon_i + (k_j+1)\varepsilon_j, 0) \in Y.$$

If $k_i + k_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$, then by (2.27) we have,

$$G(k_i\varepsilon_i + (k_j+1)\varepsilon_j, \langle j'\rangle, 2n+1, q) \in Y.$$

It follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$E(k_i\varepsilon_i+(k_j+1)\varepsilon_j,\langle j'\rangle,q)\in Y.$$

If $k_i+k_j\equiv 0 \pmod p$, then $k_i\le \pi_i-2$ or $k_j\le\pi_j-2$. Without loss of generality, suppose $k_i\le\pi_i-2$. From the above, we have

$$E((k_i+1)\varepsilon_i+(k_j+1)\varepsilon_j,\langle j'\rangle,q)\in Y.$$

Note that $E(0,\langle i'\rangle)\in Y$ and

$$E(k_i\varepsilon_i+(k_j+1)\varepsilon_j,\langle j'\rangle,q)=[E((k_i+1)\varepsilon_i+(k_j+1)\varepsilon_j,\langle j'\rangle,q),E(0,i')].$$

We have $E(k_i\varepsilon_i+(k_j+1)\varepsilon_j,\langle j'\rangle,q)\in Y$ and then

$$\begin{aligned}&E(k_i\varepsilon_i+k_j\varepsilon_j,0,2n+1,q)\\ \equiv\ &[E(k_i\varepsilon_i+(k_j+1)\varepsilon_j,0),E(0,\langle j'\rangle,2n+1,q)]\\ =\ &E(k_i\varepsilon_i+k_j\varepsilon_j,0,2n+1,q)-(k_i+k_j-1)E(k_i\varepsilon_i+(k_j+1)\varepsilon_j,\langle j'\rangle,q)\pmod Y.\end{aligned}$$

Subcase 1.1.2. Suppose $k_i=\pi_i$, $k_j=\pi_j$. By (2.18),

$$E(\pi_i\varepsilon_i+(\pi_j-1)\varepsilon_j,0,2n+1,q)\in Y.$$

It follows from (2.28) that

$$E(\pi_i\varepsilon_i+\pi_j\varepsilon_j,0,2n+1,q)\in Y.$$

Case 1.2. Suppose $i\ne j\in\overline{1,n}$, $q=i$ or $q=j$, say, $q=j$. Then $k_j\ne\pi_j$. It follows from (2.29) that

$$E(k_i\varepsilon_i+k_j\varepsilon_j,0,2n+1,q)\in Y.$$

Similar to Cases 1.1 and 1.2, using (2.19)–(2.26) we may obtain that

$$E(\varepsilon_i,\langle j'\rangle,2n+1,q),\quad E(0,\langle i',j'\rangle,2n+1,q)\in Y\quad\text{for all } i\ne j\in\overline{1,n}.$$

Then by (2.9) and induction one can show that $S_3\subseteq Y$.

Step 2. By Part 3 in the proof of Theorem 2.6 and Step 1 we have $S_4\setminus\{\pm G\}\subseteq Y$.

Step 3. Assert that $\{D_{KO}(f)\mid f\in\mathfrak{A}_2\}\cup S_2\subseteq Y$. Note that

$$\{D_{KO}(f)\mid f\in\mathfrak{A}_2\}\cup S_2\setminus\{\pm E(\pi-\varepsilon_1,\langle 2',\dots,n'\rangle,1)\}\subseteq Y$$

can be easily seen by Lemma 2.2, since $S_3\cup S_4\setminus\{\pm G\}\subseteq Y$. Note that

$$(3-n)E(\pi-\varepsilon_1,\langle 2',\dots,n'\rangle,1)\equiv[E(\pi-\varepsilon_1,0,2n+1,1),E(0,\langle 2',\dots,n'\rangle)]\pmod Y$$

and

$$(4-n)E(\pi-\varepsilon_1,\langle 2',\dots,n'\rangle,1)\equiv[G(\pi-\varepsilon_1,\langle 2'\rangle,2n+1,1),E(0,\langle 3',\dots,n'\rangle)]\pmod Y.$$

We have $E(\pi-\varepsilon_1,\langle 2',\dots,n'\rangle,1)\in Y$.

Step 4. Let us show that

$$D_{KO}(X(i_1,\dots,i_r))\in Y\quad\text{for } r\notin\mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda,n).\tag{2.30}$$

Note that

$$E(0,i'_n)\in\{D_{KO}(f)\mid f\in\mathfrak{A}_2\}\subseteq Y$$

and that for $r\in\overline{0,n}$,

$$E(\pi_{i_1}\varepsilon_{i_1}+\cdots+\pi_{i_r}\varepsilon_{i_r},\langle i'_{r+1},\cdots,i'_{n-1}\rangle,2n+1,i_n)\in S_3\subseteq Y.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}&[E(\pi_{i_1}\varepsilon_{i_1}+\cdots+\pi_{i_r}\varepsilon_{i_r},\langle i'_{r+1},\cdots,i'_{n-1}\rangle,2n+1,i_n),E(0,i'_n)]\\ =\ &(n\lambda-n+2r+2)D_{KO}(X(i_1,\ldots,i_r)),\end{aligned}$$

(2.30) holds. □

3. Simplicity and dimension formulas

Using the spanning set of $\mathfrak{g}$ (Theorem 2.8), let us prove the following

Theorem 3.1. $\mathfrak{g}$ *is a simple Lie superalgebra.*

Proof. Let I be a nonzero ideal of $\mathfrak{g}$. By Theorem 2.8, it suffices to show that $T\cup S\cup\{D_{KO}(1)\}\subset I$.

First, assert that $D_{KO}(1)\in I$. By Lemma 2.2, I must contain a nonzero element $D_{KO}(f)$ with $\partial_{2n+1}(f)=0$. Let $f=f_0x_{n'}+f_1$ be the $x_{n'}$-decomposition. Since

$$[D_{KO}(f),D_{KO}(x_n)]=(-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f)}D_{KO}(f_0),$$

one may assume that $\partial_{n'}(f)=0$. Next suppose $\underline{D_{KO}(f)}:=D_{KO}(f_0x_{j'}+f_1)\in I$, where $f=f_0x_{j'}+f_1$ is the $x_{j'}$-decomposition, $j\in\overline{1,n-1}$. Note that

$$[D_{KO}(f),D_{KO}(x_j)]=(-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f)}D_{KO}(f_0)\neq 0.$$

One may assume that $\partial_j(f)=0$ for all $j\in\overline{n+1,2n+1}$. Write

$$f=a_0x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}+a_1x^{((k-1)\varepsilon_i)}+\cdots+a_{k-1}x^{(\varepsilon_i)}+a_k,$$

where $i\in\overline{1,n}$, $\partial_i(a_j)=0,j\in\overline{0,k}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&[D_{KO}(f),D_{KO}(x_{i'})]\\ =\ &(-1)^{\mu(i)\mathrm{p}(f)}D_{KO}(a_0x^{((k-1)\varepsilon_i)}+a_1x^{((k-2)\varepsilon_i)}+\cdots+a_{k-1}).\end{aligned}$$

The assertion follows.

Second, assert that $T\subseteq I$. By Lemma 2.2, $E(0,q')$, $E(\pi_i,\langle i'\rangle,j)\in I$ for $i,q\in\overline{1,n}$. Suppose $i,q\in\overline{1,n}$. If $k_i\neq\pi_i-1$ or $q\neq i$, then

$$-E(k_i\varepsilon_i,0,2n+1,q)=[E(k_i\varepsilon_i+\varepsilon_q,0,2n+1,q),E(0,\langle q'\rangle)]\in I. \tag{3.1}$$

If $k_i=\pi_i-1$ and $q=i$, find $j\neq i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&E((\pi_i-1)\varepsilon_i,0,2n+1,i)\\ =\ &E(\pi_i,0,2n+1,j)+(n\lambda-\pi_i+1)E((\pi_i-1)\varepsilon_i,\langle i'\rangle,j)\in I.\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

The assertion follows from (3.1) and (3.2).

Finally, it suffices to show that $S\subseteq I$. This follows directly from that

$$-E(0,\langle i'\rangle,2n+1,q)=[E(0,\langle q'\rangle),E(\varepsilon_q,\langle i'\rangle,2n+1,q)]\in I,$$

where $q\neq i$. □

By Theorems 2.1, 2.6 and [7, Theorem 4.7] we can compute the dimension of $\mathfrak{g}$:

Theorem 3.2.

$$\begin{aligned}\dim \mathfrak{g} &= 2\Big(\sum_{l=2}^{n}\Big((2^{n-1}-2^{n-l})\sum_{(i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_l)\in J(l)}\prod_{c=1}^{l}\pi_{i_c}\Big)+\prod_{j=1}^{n}(\pi_j+2)\Big)\\ &\quad -\sum_{k_i\in\mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda,n)}\binom{n}{k_i}-2^n-\delta'_{n\lambda,-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By [7, Theorem 4.7] and (1.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_1\cup S_2) &= \dim SHO'(n,n;\underline{t})\\ &= \sum_{l=2}^{n}\Big((2^{n-1}-2^{n-l})\sum_{(i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_l)\in J(l)}\prod_{c=1}^{l}\pi_{i_c}\Big)\\ &\quad +\prod_{j=1}^{m}(\pi_j+2)-1.\end{aligned}$$

By [7, Theorem 4.7] and (1.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{F}}(S_3\cup S_4) &= \dim \overline{SHO}(n,n;\underline{t})+1\\ &= \sum_{l=2}^{n}\Big((2^{n-1}-2^{n-l})\sum_{(i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_l)\in J(l)}\prod_{c=1}^{l}\pi_{i_c}\Big)\\ &\quad +\prod_{j=1}^{m}(\pi_j+2)-2^n.\end{aligned}$$

Our formula follows from Theorems 2.1, 2.6 and 2.7. □

To make a comparison between the special odd contact superalgebras and the other simple Lie superalgebras of Cartan type, we list certain known dimension formulas.

Lemma 3.3 (see [7, 9])**.** *Suppose* $m,n>2$, $\underline{t}\in\mathbb{N}^m$.

(i) $\dim W(m,n;\underline{t})=(m+n)\cdot 2^n\cdot p^{\sum_{i=1}^{m}t_i}$.

(ii) $\dim H(m,n;\underline{t})=2^n\cdot p^{\sum_{i=1}^{m}t_i}-2$.

(iii) $\dim K(m,n;\underline{t})=\begin{cases}2^n\cdot p^{\sum_{i=1}^{m}t_i} & \textit{if } n-m-3\not\equiv 0 \pmod p\\ 2^n\cdot p^{\sum_{i=1}^{m}t_i}-1 & \textit{if } n-m-3\equiv 0 \pmod p).\end{cases}$

(iv) $\dim S(m,n;\underline{t})=(m+n-1)\cdot 2^n\cdot p^{\sum_{i=1}^{m}t_i}-m+1$.

(v) $\dim HO(m,m;\underline{t})=2^m\cdot p^{\sum_{i=1}^{m}t_i}-1$.

(vi) $\dim SHO(n,n;\underline{t})=\sum_{l=2}^{n}\Big((2^{n-1}-2^{n-l})\sum\limits_{(i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_l)\in J(l)}\prod_{c=1}^{l}\pi_{i_c}\Big)+\prod_{j=1}^{n}(\pi_j+2)-2^n-2$.

(vii) $\dim KO(n,n+1;\underline{t})=2^{n+1}p^{\sum_{i=1}^{n}t_i}$.

Corollary 3.4. *$SKO(p{+}2, p{+}3; (p{-}1)/2, \underline{r})$ is not isomorphic to any Lie superalgebras of Cartan type $W(m, n; \underline{t})$, $H(m, n; \underline{t})$, $KO(m, m{+}1; \underline{t})$ or $SHO(m, m; \underline{t})$ for arbitrary integers $m, n > 2$, $\underline{r} \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}$ and $\underline{t} \in \mathbb{N}^m$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim SKO(p+2, p+3; (p-1)/2, \underline{t}) \quad &= \quad 2\Big(\sum_{l=2}^{p+2}\Big((2^{p+1} - 2^{p+2-l}) \sum_{(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_l) \in J(l)} \prod_{c=1}^{l} \pi_{i_c}\Big) \\ &\quad + \prod_{j=1}^{p+2}(\pi_j + 2)\Big) - 2^{p+2} - 1.\end{aligned}$$

Then $\dim SKO(p+2, p+3; (p-1)/2, \underline{t})$ is odd and our corollary follows from Lemma 3.3. □

Remark 3.5. *Further comparison between the special odd contact superalgebras and the special superalgebras is left to discuss in Section 5, where we shall use the structures of the outer superderivation algebras (see Corollary 5.3 and Remark 5.4).*

4. Superderivations

Define a new multiplication $[\ ,\ ]$ in $\mathcal{O}$,

$$[a, b] := D_{KO}(a)(b) - (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(a)} 2(\partial_{2n+1} a) b.$$

Then $(\mathcal{O}, [\ ,\ ])$ is a Lie superalgebra. Since $\mathfrak{g}''$ is a subalgebra of $KO(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t})$, it is easy to see that $\{a \mid \mathrm{div}_\lambda(a) = 0, a \in \mathcal{O}\}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}$. By [3], the mapping

$$\mathcal{O} \longrightarrow KO(n, n+1; \underline{t}), \quad D_{KO} : a \longmapsto D_{KO}(a)$$

is an isomorphism of Lie superalgebras. Therefore,

$$\mathfrak{g}'' \cong \{a \mid \mathrm{div}_\lambda(a) = 0, a \in \mathcal{O}\}.$$

In this section we sometimes identify $D_{KO}(f)$ with f for $f \in \mathcal{O}$. Let $\mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g}$ be the superderivation algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded Lie superalgebra:

$$\mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g} = \oplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{Der}_t \mathfrak{g}, \quad \mathrm{Der}_t \mathfrak{g} := \{\phi \in \mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g} \mid \phi(\mathfrak{g}_j) \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_{j+t}, \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

For $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$ and $f \in \mathcal{O}$, define

$$\delta_{if} := \begin{cases} 0, & \partial_i(f) = 0 \\ 1, & \partial_i(f) \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Let $T := \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{F} h_k$, where $h_k := x_k x_{k'}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $h_i := x_i x_{i'}$, $i \in \overline{1, n}$. Then $h_i \in \mathrm{Nor}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{g})$.*

Proof. For $f \in \mathfrak{g}$, we want to show that $[h_i, f] \in \mathfrak{g}$. By Theorem 2.8, without loss of generality one may assume that $f = f_0 x_{2n+1} + f_1$ is an element in $T \cup S \cup \{1\}$. Then

$$[x_i x_{i'}, f] = \delta_{i' f_0} f_0 x_{2n+1} - \delta_{i f_0} \alpha_i f_0 x_{2n+1} + \delta_{i' f_1} f_1 - \delta_{i f_1}(\alpha_i + \delta_{i' f_1}) f_1, \tag{4.1}$$

where $i \in \overline{1, n}$. Now it needs only a straightforward verification. □

Lemma 4.2. *If* $f \in \mathrm{Nor}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{g})$ *and* $\partial_{2n+1}(f) = 0$. *Then* $f \in \mathfrak{g}'' + T$.

Proof. Since $x_i \in \mathfrak{g}$ for all $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$, we have $[x_i, f] \in \mathfrak{g}$ and then $\Delta([x_i, f]) = 0$. It is easy to verify that $\partial_i(\Delta(f)) = 0$ for all $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$. It follows that $\Delta(f) \in \mathbb{F}$. Consequently, $\Delta(f - \Delta(f)h_1) = 0$. Therefore, $f - \Delta(f)h_1 \in \mathfrak{g}''$ and $f \in \mathfrak{g}'' + T$. □

Lemma 4.3. $\mathrm{Nor}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathfrak{g}'' + T$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, $\mathfrak{g}'' + T \subseteq \mathrm{Nor}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{g})$. Let us consider the converse inclusion. Let $f = f_0 x_{2n+1} + f_1 \in \mathrm{Nor}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the x_{2n+1}-decomposition. Since $1 \in \mathfrak{g}$, we have $[f_0 x_{2n+1} + f_1, 1] = 2f_0 \in \mathfrak{g}$ and f_0 is a linear combination of $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \{1\}$. Without loss of generality, suppose $f_0 \in S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \{1\}$.

Case 1. Suppose $f_0 \in \mathfrak{A}_2 \cup S_2$. In this case, f_0 is integral. Then there is $q \in \overline{1, n}$ such that

$$f_0 x_{2n+1} + (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))\nabla_q(f_0) \in \mathfrak{g}'' \subseteq \mathrm{Nor}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))\nabla_q(f_0) - f_1 \\ = \quad & f_0 x_{2n+1} + (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))\nabla_q(f_0) - (f_0 x_{2n+1} + f_1) \in \mathrm{Nor}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{g}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.2, we have

$$(-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))\nabla_q(f_0) - f_1 \in \mathfrak{g}'' + T.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 x_{2n+1} + f_1 \quad = \quad & f_0 x_{2n+1} + f_1 - (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))\nabla_q(f_0) \\ & + (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))\nabla_q(f_0) \\ = \quad & f_0 x_{2n+1} + (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))\nabla_q(f_0) \\ & + f_1 - (-1)^{\mathrm{p}(f_0)}(n\lambda - \mathrm{zd}(f_0))\nabla_q(f_0) \in \mathfrak{g}'' + T. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. Suppose $f_0 \in \mathfrak{A}_1$. By (2.8) there is $r \in \overline{1, n}$ such that $f_0 = X(i_1, \ldots, i_n)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & -(n\lambda - n + 2r) f_0 x_{2n+1} + (\mathrm{zd}(f_1) - 2 - n\lambda\delta_{i_1 f_1} + n\lambda\delta_{i'_1 f_1}) x_{i_1} \partial_{i_1}(f_1) \\ = \quad & [f_0 x_{2n+1} + f_1, x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_{i_1} x_{i'_1}] \in \mathfrak{g}, \end{aligned}$$

we have $n\lambda - n + 2r = 0$, that is, $f_0 x_{2n+1} \in \mathfrak{g}'' \subset \mathrm{Nor}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{g})$. Therefore, $f_1 \in \mathrm{Nor}_{\mathcal{O}}(g)$. By Lemma 4.2, we know that $f_1 \in \mathfrak{g}'' + T$. Hence $\mathrm{Nor}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathfrak{g}) \subseteq \mathfrak{g}'' + T$ and the proof is complete. □

One can directly verify the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4.4. *Let* $f \in \mathfrak{g}$ *and* $[f, x_i] =: b_i$, $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$. *Let* $\phi \in \mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g}$ *such that* $\phi(x_i) = \phi(b_i) = 0$ *for all* $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$. *Then* $\phi(f) \in \mathfrak{g}_{-2}$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let* $s \geq -1$ *and* $\phi \in \mathrm{Der}_t\mathfrak{g}$ *satisfy that* $\phi(\mathfrak{g}_j) = 0$ *for all* $j \in \overline{-2, s}$. *If* $s + t \geq -2$, *then* $\phi = 0$.

Proposition 4.6. $\mathrm{Der}_{-2}\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{ad}\mathfrak{g}_{-2}$, $\mathrm{Der}_{-3}\mathfrak{g} = 0$.

Proof. (1) Let us first show that $\mathrm{Der}_{-2}\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{ad}\mathfrak{g}_{-2}$. Let $\phi \in \mathrm{Der}_{-2}\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\phi(\mathfrak{g}_j) = 0$ for $j = -2, -1$. Write $\phi(x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_i x_{i'}) = c_i \in \mathfrak{g}_{-2}$ for $i \in \overline{1, n}$. Put $\psi := \phi + \frac{1}{2}c_1\mathrm{ad}1$. Then $\psi(\mathfrak{g}_j) = 0$ for $j = -2, -1$ and $\psi(x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_i x_{i'}) = c_i - c_1$ for all $i \in \overline{1, n}$. Suppose $\psi(x_i x_j) = d_{ij} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-2}$ for $i \neq j' \in \overline{1, 2n}$ and $\psi(x_i x_{i'} - x_j x_{j'}) = e_{ij} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-2}$ for $i \neq j \in \overline{1, n}$.

(1a) Note that

$$[x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_i x_{i'}, x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_1 x_{1'}] = 0 \quad \text{for all } 1 \neq i \in \overline{1, n}.$$

Applying ψ to the equation above, we have

$$0 = [\psi(x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_i x_{i'}), x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_1 x_{1'}] = -2(c_i - c_1).$$

It follows that $c_i = c_1$.

(1b) Choose distinct $i, j, k, k' \in \overline{1, 2n}$. Applying ψ to the following equation

$$[x_i x_j, x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_k x_{k'}] = 0,$$

one gets

$$0 = [\psi(x_i x_j), x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_k x_{k'}] = [d_{ij}, x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_k x_{k'}] = -2d_{ij}.$$

It follows that $d_{ij} = 0$.

(1c) For distinct $i, j, k \in \overline{1, n}$, applying ψ to the following equation

$$[x_i x_{i'} - x_j x_{j'}, x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_k x_{k'}] = 0,$$

one gets

$$0 = [\psi(x_i x_{i'} - x_j x_{j'}), x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_k x_{k'}] = -2e_{ij}.$$

It follows that $e_{ij} = 0$.

Summarizing, we have $\psi(\mathfrak{g}_0) = 0$. By Lemma 4.5, $\psi = 0$, that is, $\mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g}_{-2} = \mathrm{ad}\mathfrak{g}_{-2}$.

(2) It remains to show that $\mathrm{Der}_{-3}\mathfrak{g} = 0$. Let $\phi \in \mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g}_{-3}$. Then $\phi(\mathfrak{g}_j) = 0$ for $j = -2, -1, 0$. Write for $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$, $j \in \overline{1, n}$ with $j' \neq i$,

$$\phi(x_i x_{2n+1} + (-1)^{\mu(i)}(n\lambda - 1)\nabla_j(x_i)) = c_{ij} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-2}.$$

Write for $i, j, k \in \overline{1, 2n}$ satisfying that $\Delta(x_i x_j x_k) = 0$,

$$\phi(x_i x_j x_k) = d_{ijk} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-2}.$$

Write for $i, k \in \overline{1, n}, j \in \overline{1, 2n}$ satisfying that $\Delta(x_i x_{i'} x_j - x_k x_{k'} x_j) = 0$,

$$\phi(x_i x_{i'} x_j - x_k x_{k'} x_j) = e_{ijk} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-2}.$$

(2a) Fix any $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$ and $j \in \overline{1, n}$ with $j' \neq i$. Applying ϕ to the following equation

$$[x_i x_{2n+1} + (-1)^{\mu(i)}(n\lambda - 1)\nabla_j(x_i), x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'}] = x_i x_{2n+1} + (-1)^{\mu(i)}(n\lambda - 1)\nabla_j(x_i),$$

we have

$$[\phi(x_i x_{2n+1} + (-1)^{\mu(i)}(n\lambda - 1)\nabla_j(x_i)), x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'}] = \phi(x_i x_{2n+1} + (-1)^{\mu(i)}(n\lambda - 1)\nabla_j(x_i)).$$

It follows that $-2c_{ij} = c_{ij}$, that is, $c_{ij} = 0$.

(2b) Suppose $\Delta(x_ix_jx_k)=0$ for some $i,j,k\in\overline{1,2n}$. Applying ϕ to the following equation

$$[x_ix_j,x_kx_{2n+1}+(-1)^{\mu(k)}(n\lambda-1)x_ix_{i'}x_k]=\pm(n\lambda-1)x_ix_jx_k,$$

we have

$$0=\pm(n\lambda-1)\phi(x_ix_jx_k)=\pm(n\lambda-1)d_{ijk}.$$

Thus, if $n\lambda-1\neq0$ then $d_{ijk}=0$. Applying ϕ to the following equation

$$[x_ix_jx_k,x_{2n+1}+n\lambda x_ix_{i'}]=(\pm n\lambda+1)x_ix_jx_k,$$

we have

$$-2d_{ijk}=(\pm n\lambda+1)d_{ijk}.$$

If $n\lambda-1=0$ then $n\lambda+3\neq0$. It follows that $d_{ijk}=0$.

(2c) Suppose $\Delta(x_ix_{i'}x_j-x_kx_{k'}x_j)=0$ for some $i,k\in\overline{1,n}$, $j\in\overline{1,2n}$. Applying ϕ to the following equation

$$[x_jx_{j'}-x_ix_{i'},x_ix_{i'}x_j-x_kx_{k'}x_j]=-x_ix_{i'}x_j+x_kx_{k'}x_j,$$

we have

$$0=[x_jx_{j'}-x_ix_{i'},e_{ijk}]=-e_{ijk}.$$

It follows that $e_{ijk}=0$. The proof is complete. □

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose $\phi\in\mathrm{Der}_{-t}\mathfrak{g}$, $t>3$. Then*

$$\phi(x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_j)=\phi(x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}-x^{((t-2)\varepsilon_i)}x_kx_{k'})=0$$

for all $i,k\in\overline{1,n}$ and $j\in\overline{1,2n}$ with $i\neq j,j',k$.

Proof. Fix any $i,k\in\overline{1,n}$ and $j\in\overline{1,2n}$ with $i\neq j,j',k$. Write

$$\phi(x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}-x^{((t-2)\varepsilon_i)}x_kx_{k'})=d_{ik}\in\mathfrak{g}_{-2}.$$

Note that

$$[x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}-x^{((t-2)\varepsilon_i)}x_kx_{k'},x_ix_{i'}-x_kx_{k'}]=(t-2)(x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}-x^{((t-2)\varepsilon_i)}x_kx_{k'}),$$
$$[x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}-x^{((t-2)\varepsilon_i)}x_kx_{k'},x_{2n+1}+n\lambda x_jx_{j'}]=(t-2)(x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}-x^{((t-2)\varepsilon_i)}x_kx_{k'}).$$

Applying ϕ to the two equations above, one can obtain that $(t-2)d_{ik}=0$ and $td_{ik}=0$. Since $p>3$, we have $d_{ik}=0$. Given $i,k\in\overline{1,n}$, $j\in\overline{1,2n}$ with $i\neq j,j',k\neq i$, apply ϕ to the equation below

$$[x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}-x^{((t-2)\varepsilon_i)}x_kx_{k'},x^{(\varepsilon_i)}x_j]=-x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_j.$$

We have $\phi(x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_j)=0$. □

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose $t>3$ and $\phi\in\mathrm{Der}_{-t}\mathfrak{g}$ such that $\phi(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)})=0$ for all $i\in\overline{1,n}$. Then $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j)=0$ for all $k\in\overline{0,p^{t_i}-1}$ and $j\in\overline{1,2n}$ with $i\neq j'$.*

Proof. (1) We first show that $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)})=0$ for all $k\in\overline{0,p^{t_i}-1}$. Note that $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)})=0$ for all $k\in\overline{0,t}$. If $k>t$, by applying ϕ to $[x^{(k\varepsilon_i)},x_l]=\delta_{il'}x^{((k-1)\varepsilon_i)}$ for $l\in\overline{1,2n}$ we obtain by inductive hypothesis that $\phi(x^{((k-1)\varepsilon_i)})=\phi(x_l)=0$. Then by Lemma 4.4, $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)})\in\mathfrak{g}_{-2}\cap\mathfrak{g}_{k-t-2}$. Hence $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)})=0$ for all $t<k<p^{t_i}$.

(2) Let us show that $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j)=0$ for all $k\in\overline{0,p^{t_i-1}}$, $j\in\overline{1,2n}$ and $i\in\overline{1,n}$ with $j'\neq i$.

(2.1) Suppose $k<t-1$. As $x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j\in\mathfrak{g}_{k-1}$, we have $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j)\in\mathfrak{g}_{k-1-t}$ and then $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j)=0$.

(2.2) By Lemma 4.7, $\phi(x^{((t-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_j)=0$.

(2.3) Suppose $k>t-1$ and use induction on k. Put

$$b_l:=[x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j,x_l]=\delta_{il'}x^{((k-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_j+(-1)^{\mu(i)}\delta_{jl'}x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}\quad\text{for }\ l\in\overline{1,2n}.$$

By inductive hypothesis, $\phi(b_l)=\phi(x_l)=0$. Then by Lemma 4.4, we have $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j)\in\mathfrak{g}_{-2}\cap\mathfrak{g}_{k-1-t}$ for all $k>t-1$. Therefore, $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j)=0$. The proof is complete. □

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose* $t>3$ *and* $\phi\in\mathrm{Der}_{-t}\mathfrak{g}$ *such that* $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j)=0$ *for all* $k\in\overline{0,p^{t_i}-1}$, $i\in\overline{1,n}$ *and* $j\in\overline{1,2n}$ *with* $i\neq j'$. *Then* $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-k)\nabla_q(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}))=0$ *for all* $q\in\widetilde{I}(k\varepsilon_i,0)$.

Proof. (1) Since $t>3$ and $\phi\in\mathrm{Der}_{-t}\mathfrak{g}$, we have $\phi(x^{(\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-1)\nabla_q(x^{(\varepsilon_i)}))=0$.

(2) Suppose $k=2,t>4$. For any $\phi\in\mathrm{Der}_{-t}\mathfrak{g}$, it is clear that $\phi(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-2)\nabla_q(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)}))=0$.

(3) Suppose $k=2,t=4$. Write $\phi(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-2)\nabla_q(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)}))=c_{iq}\in\mathfrak{g}_{-2}$. Pick $m\neq i,q$. Applying ϕ to the equation that

$$[x^{(2\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-2)\nabla_q(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)}),x_{2n+1}+n\lambda x_mx_{m'}]=2(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-2)\nabla_q(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)})),$$

one can obtain that $-2c_{iq}=2c_{iq}$. If follows that $c_{iq}=0$.

(4) Suppose $k>2$ and use induction on k. For $j\in\overline{1,2n}$, put

$$\begin{aligned}b_j\ &:=\ [x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-k)\nabla_q(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}),x_j]\\ &=\ \delta_{i'j}x^{((k-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+\delta_{i'j}(n\lambda-k)\nabla_q(x^{((k-1)\varepsilon_i)})\\ &\quad\ +\delta_{q'j}x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_{q'}+\delta_{qj}(1-\delta_{ij})(n\lambda-k)x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j+x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_j.\end{aligned}$$

By induction hypothesis, we have $\phi(x_j)=\phi(b_j)=0$. Then by Lemma 4.4,

$$\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-k)\nabla_q(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}))\in\mathfrak{g}_{-2}\cap\mathfrak{g}_{k-t}.$$

(4.1) Suppose $k\neq t-2$. Then $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-k)\nabla_q(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}))=0$.

(4.2) Suppose $k=t-2$. Write $\phi(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-k)\nabla_q(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}))=c_{iq}\in\mathfrak{g}_{-2}$. Applying ϕ to the equation below,

$$[x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-k)\nabla_q(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}),x_{2n+1}+n\lambda x_qx_{q'}]=k(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-k)\nabla_q(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}))$$

one gets $-2c_{iq}=kc_{iq}$.

(4.2.1) If $k+2\not\equiv 0\pmod p$, then $c_{iq}=0$.

(4.2.2) If $k+2\equiv 0\pmod p$, applying ϕ to the equation

$$\begin{aligned}&[x^{((k-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-(k-1))\nabla_q(x^{((k-1)\varepsilon_i)}),x^{(\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-1)\nabla_q(x^{(\varepsilon_i)})]\\ =\ &(k-2)(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)}x_{2n+1}+(n\lambda-k)\nabla_q(x^{(k\varepsilon_i)})),\end{aligned}$$

we have $c_{iq}=0$. □

Proposition 4.10. *If $t>3$ is not a p-power, then* $\mathrm{Der}_{-t}\mathfrak{g}=0$.

Proof. Let $\phi\in\mathrm{Der}_{-t}\mathfrak{g}$. By Lemmas 4.8, 4.9 and Theorem 2.8, it suffices to show that $\phi(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)})=0$ for all $i\in\overline{1,n}$. Let $\phi(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)})=c_i\in\mathfrak{g}_{-2}$ and pick $i\neq k\in\overline{1,n}$. Applying ϕ to the following equation that

$$[x^{(t\varepsilon_i)},x_{2n+1}+n\lambda x_kx_{k'}]=(t-2)x^{(t\varepsilon_i)},$$

one can obtain that $-2c_i=(t-2)c_i$ and therefore, $tc_i=0$.

If $t\not\equiv 0 \pmod p$, then $c_i=0$. Otherwise, write t as the p-adic from

$$t=\sum_{i=1}^{l}\alpha_ip^i,\ 0\leq\alpha_i<p,\ \alpha_l\neq 0.$$

As $t\neq p^l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\phi(x^{(p^l\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}-x^{((p^l-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_kx_{k'})\in\mathfrak{g}_{[p^l-1-t]}=0,\\&\phi(x^{((t-p^l+1)\varepsilon_i)})\in\mathfrak{g}_{[-p^l-1]}=0.\end{aligned}$$

Applying ϕ to

$$[x^{((t-p^l+1)\varepsilon_i)},x^{(p^l\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}-x^{((p^l-1)\varepsilon_i)}x_kx_{k'}]=\binom{t}{p^l}x^{(t\varepsilon_i)},$$

one gets $\phi(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)})=0$. The proof is complete. □

Proposition 4.11. *Let $t=p^d$ for some $d\in\mathbb{N}$. Then* $\mathrm{Der}_{-t}\mathfrak{g}=\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{\partial_i^t\mid i\in\overline{1,n}\}$.

Proof. Let $\phi\in\mathrm{Der}_{-t}\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\phi(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)})=c_i\in\mathfrak{g}_{-2}$. Putting $\psi:=\phi-\sum_{j=1}^nc_j\partial_j^t$, we have $\psi(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)})=0$. Then by Lemmas 4.8, 4.9 and Theorem 2.8, we have $\psi=0$, that is, $\phi=\sum_{j=1}^nc_j\partial_j^t$. This proves

$$\mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g}_{-t}\subseteq\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{\partial_i^t\mid i\in\overline{1,n}\}.$$

Note that in general,

$$[\partial_i^{p^r},D_{KO}(a)]=D_{KO}(\partial_i^{p^r}(a))\quad\text{and}\quad\mathrm{div}_\lambda(\partial_i^{p^r}(a))=\partial_i^{p^r}(\mathrm{div}_\lambda(a))$$

for $a\in\mathcal{O}$ and $r\in\mathbb{N}$. One sees that $\partial_i^{p^r}$ is a derivation of $\mathfrak{g}$ and then the converse inclusion holds. □

Given $i\in\overline{1,n}$, an element $a\in\mathcal{O}$ is called x_i-truncated if each nonzero monomial $kx^{(\alpha)}x^u$ of a satisfies that $\alpha_i<p^{t_i}-1$. We need a technical lemma:

Lemma 4.12. *Suppose $a_i\in\mathcal{O}$ satisfy that $\partial_i(a_j)=(-1)^{\mu(i)\mu(j)}\partial_j(a_i)$ for all $i,j\in\overline{1,2n+1}$. The the following statements hold.*

(1) *$\partial_i(a_i)=0$ for all $i\in\overline{n+1,2n+1}$;*

(2) *For $i\in\overline{1,n}$, a_i has only one nonzero monomial of the form $c_ix^{(\pi_i\varepsilon_i)},c_i\in\mathbb{F}$;*

(3) *If a_i is x_i-truncated, then there exists $f\in\mathcal{O}$ such that $a_i=\partial_i(f)$ for all $i\in\overline{1,2n+1}$.*

Lemma 4.13. *If $\phi\in\mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g}$, then there is $f\in\mathcal{O}$ such that $(\phi-\mathrm{ad}f)(\mathfrak{g}_j)=0$ for $j=-1,-2$.*

Proof. Let $\phi \in \mathrm{Der}_\alpha \mathfrak{g}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. Put

$$a_{2n+1} := (-1)^{\alpha}\frac{1}{2}\phi(1)$$

and for $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$,

$$a_i := (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}\phi(x_{i'}) + (-1)^{\mu(i')}x_{i'}a_{2n+1}.$$

By applying ϕ to $[1, x_{i'}] = 0$ for $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$, we have

$$(-1)^{\alpha}2[a_{2n+1}, x_{i'}] + (-1)^{\alpha+\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}[1, a_i] + (-1)^{\alpha+\mu(i)\alpha}[1, a_{2n+1}x_{i'}] = 0,$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^{\alpha+\mu(i)\alpha}2\partial_i(a_{2n+1}) + 2\partial_{2n+1}(a_{2n+1}x_{i'}) \\ = \ & (-1)^{\alpha+\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}2\partial_{2n+1}(a_i) + (-1)^{\alpha+\mu(i)\alpha}2\partial_{2n+1}(a_{2n+1}x_{i'}). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $\partial_{2n+1}(a_{2n+1}) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\partial_i(a_{2n+1}) = (-1)^{\mu(i)}\partial_{2n+1}(a_i) \quad \text{for all } i \in \overline{1, 2n}.$$

Since $[x_{i'}, x_{j'}] = 0$ for $i, j \in \overline{1, 2n}$ with $j \neq i'$, we have

$$[\phi(x_{i'}), x_{j'}] + (-1)^{\alpha\mu(i)}[x_{i'}, \phi(x_{j'})] = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)+\mu(j)(\alpha+\mu(i'))}\partial_j(a_i) - (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)+\alpha+\mu(i')}\partial_{2n+1}(a_i)x_{j'} \\ & -(-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(j)(\alpha+\mu(i'))}\partial_j(x_{i'}a_{2n+1}) + (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\alpha+\mu(i')}\partial_{2n+1}(x_{i'}a_{2n+1})x_{j'} \\ & +(-1)^{\alpha(\mu(i)+\mu(j))+\mu(j)+\mu(i')}\partial_i(a_j) - (-1)^{\alpha(\mu(i)+\mu(j))+\mu(j)}x_{i'}\partial_{2n+1}(a_j) \\ & +(-1)^{\alpha(\mu(i)+\mu(j))+\mu(i')}\partial_i(x_{j'}a_{2n+1}) - (-1)^{\alpha(\mu(i)+\mu(j))}x_{i'}\partial_{2n+1}(x_{j'}a_{2n+1}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & -(-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)+\alpha+\mu(i')}\partial_{2n+1}(a_i)x_{j'} + (-1)^{\alpha(\mu(i)+\mu(j))+\mu(i')}\partial_i(x_{j'}a_{2n+1}) = 0; \\ & -(-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(j)(\alpha+\mu(i'))}\partial_j(x_{i'}a_{2n+1}) - (-1)^{\alpha(\mu(i)+\mu(j))+\mu(j)}x_{i'}\partial_{2n+1}(a_j) = 0; \\ & (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\alpha+\mu(i')}\partial_{2n+1}(x_{i'}a_{2n+1})x_{j'} = 0; \\ & (-1)^{\alpha(\mu(i)+\mu(j))}x_{i'}\partial_{2n+1}(x_{j'}a_{2n+1}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\partial_j(a_i) = (-1)^{\mu(i)\mu(j)}\partial_i(a_j).$$

In the same way, applying ϕ to $[x_i, x_{i'}] = (-1)^{\mu(i)}1$ for $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^{\mu(i')\alpha+\mu(i')+\mu(i)(\alpha+\mu(i))}\partial_i(a_{i'}) - (-1)^{\mu(i')\alpha+\mu(i')+\alpha+\mu(i)}\partial_{2n+1}(a_{i'})x_{i'} \\ & +(-1)^{\mu(i')\alpha+\mu(i)(\alpha+\mu(i))}\partial_i(x_ia_{2n+1}) - (-1)^{\mu(i')\alpha+\alpha+\mu(i)}\partial_{2n+1}(x_ia_{2n+1})x_{i'} \\ & +(-1)^{\alpha\mu(i')+\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)+\mu(i)}\partial_{i'}(a_i) - (-1)^{\alpha\mu(i')+\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}x_i\partial_{2n+1}(a_i) \\ & +(-1)^{\alpha\mu(i')+\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}\partial_{i'}(x_{i'}a_{2n+1}) - (-1)^{\alpha\mu(i')+\mu(i)\alpha}x_i\partial_{2n+1}(x_{i'}a_{2n+1}) \\ = \ & (-1)^{\mu(i)+\alpha}2a_{2n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & -(-1)^{\mu(i')\alpha+\mu(i')+\alpha+\mu(i)}\partial_{2n+1}(a_{i'})x_{i'} + (-1)^{\alpha\mu(i')+\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}\partial_{i'}(x_{i'}a_{2n+1}) \\ & +(-1)^{\mu(i')\alpha+\mu(i)(\alpha+\mu(i))}\partial_i(x_i a_{2n+1}) - (-1)^{\alpha\mu(i')+\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}x_i\partial_{2n+1}(a_i) \\ = \;& (-1)^{\mu(i)+\alpha}2a_{2n+1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(-1)^{\mu(i')\alpha+\alpha+\mu(i)}\partial_{2n+1}(x_i a_{2n+1})x_{i'} = (-1)^{\alpha\mu(i')+\mu(i)\alpha}x_i\partial_{2n+1}(x_{i'}a_{2n+1}) = 0,$$

one can gets

$$\partial_i(a_{i'}) = (-1)^{\mu(i)\mu(i')}\partial_{i'}(a_i) \quad \text{for all } i \in \overline{1, 2n}.$$

We have proved that

$$\partial_i(a_j) = (-1)^{\mu(i)\mu(j)}\partial_j(a_i) \quad \text{for all } i, j \in \overline{1, 2n+1}.$$

Next, we want to show that a_i is x_i-truncated for $i \in \overline{1, n}$. Pick $i, i' \neq j \in \overline{1, n}$. Applying ϕ to the following equation that

$$[x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'}, 1] = 2,$$

one gets

$$[\phi(x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'}), 1] + [x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'}, \phi(1)] = 2\phi(1),$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & -(-1)^{\alpha}2\partial_{2n+1}(\phi(x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'})) - \mathfrak{D}(\phi(1)) \\ & -2x_{2n+1}\partial_{2n+1}(\phi(1)) + n\lambda(x_{j'}\partial_{j'}(\phi(1)) - x_j\partial_j(\phi(1))) + 2\phi(1) \\ = \;& 2\phi(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$-\partial_{2n+1}(\phi(x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'})) = \mathfrak{D}(a_{2n+1}) + n\lambda(x_j\partial_j(a_{2n+1}) - x_{j'}\partial_{j'}(a_{2n+1})). \tag{4.2}$$

Applying ϕ to the equation that

$$[x_{i'}, x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'}] = -x_{i'},$$

one can get

$$[\phi(x_{i'}), x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'}] + [x_{i'}, \phi(x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'})] = -\phi(x_{i'}),$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & [(-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}a_i - (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha}x_{i'}a_{2n+1}, x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'}] \\ = \;& -[x_{i'}, \phi(x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'})] - (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}a_i + (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha}x_{i'}a_{2n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

In combination with (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}\mathfrak{D}(a_i) - 2(-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}a_i + 2(-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}\partial_{2n+1}(a_i)x_{2n+1} \\ & +(-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}n\lambda(\partial_j(a_i)x_j - \partial_{j'}(a_i)x_{j'}) - (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha}\mathfrak{D}(x_{i'}a_{2n+1}) \\ & +(-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha}2x_{i'}a_{2n+1} + n\lambda(-(-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha}\partial_j(x_{i'}a_{2n+1}))x_j - (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}\partial_{j'}(a_i)x_{j'}) \\ & -\partial_i(\phi(x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_j x_{j'})) + x_{i'}(\mathfrak{D}(a_{2n+1}) + n\lambda(x_j\partial_j(a_{2n+1}) - x_{j'}\partial_{j'}(a_{2n+1}))) \\ = \;& -(-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha+\mu(i)}a_i + (-1)^{\mu(i)\alpha}x_{i'}a_{2n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.12(2), $a_i = x + c_i x^{(\pi_i \varepsilon_i)}$, where x is x_i-truncated. Substituting a_i with $x + c_i x^{(\pi_i \varepsilon_i)}$ and observing the coefficient of $x^{(\pi_i \varepsilon_i)}$ we obtain that $\pi_i c_i - 2c_i = -c_i$. Consequently, $2c_i = 0$, that is, a_i is x_i-truncated. By Lemma 4.12(1) and (3), there exists $f \in \mathcal{O}$ such that

$$a_i = \partial_i(f) \quad \text{for all } i \in \overline{1, 2n+1}.$$

Then we have

$$(\phi - \mathrm{ad}(f))(\mathfrak{g}_j) = 0 \quad \text{for } j = -2, -1.$$

By Lemma 4.5, the proof is complete. □

Lemma 4.14. *Suppose* $\phi \in \mathrm{Der}_t\mathfrak{g}$, $t \geq -1$. *Then there exists* $f \in \mathcal{O}$ *such that* $\phi = \mathrm{ad}f$.

Proof. Let $\phi \in \mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g}$. By Lemma 4.13, there exists $f \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $(\phi - \mathrm{ad}(f))(\mathfrak{g}_j) = 0$ for $j = -2, -1$. Since $t \geq -1$, by Lemma 4.5 we have $\phi - \mathrm{ad}f = 0$, that is, $\phi = \mathrm{ad}f$. □

We are in the position to determine completely the superderivation algebra of the special odd contact superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Recall that $T := \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{F}x_k x_{k'}$.

Theorem 4.15. $\mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{ad}\mathfrak{g}'' + \mathrm{ad}T \oplus \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{\partial_i^{p^{d_i}} \mid 1 \leq d_i \leq t_i - 1, i \in \overline{1, n}\}$.

Proof. Note that any p-power of an even superderivation is again an even superderivation and that $[[\mathfrak{g}'', \mathfrak{g}''], [\mathfrak{g}'', \mathfrak{g}'']] = \mathfrak{g}$. By Lemma 4.3, we have $\mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g} \supseteq \mathrm{ad}\mathfrak{g}'' + \mathrm{ad}T \oplus \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{\partial_i^{p^{d_i}} \mid 1 \leq d_i \leq t_i - 1, i \in \overline{1, n}\}$. The converse inclusion follows from Lemma 4.3, Propositions 4.6, 4.10, 4.11 and Lemma 4.14. □

Remark 4.16. *The degree derivation* deg *of* $\mathfrak{g}$ *is*

$$-\mathrm{ad}x_{2n+1} = -\mathrm{ad}(x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_1 x_{1'}) + n\lambda \mathrm{ad}(x_1 x_{1'}) \in \mathrm{ad}\mathfrak{g}'' + \mathrm{ad}T.$$

5. First cohomology

Recall that $\mathfrak{g}$ denotes the special odd contact superalgebra $SKO(n, n+1; \lambda, \underline{t})$, where $n \geq 3$ is an integer and $\underline{t} := (t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is an n-tuple of positive integers. Denote the outer superderivation algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ by $\mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}\mathfrak{g} := \mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g}/\mathrm{ad}\mathfrak{g}$, which is isomorphic to the first cohomology group. In this section we shall characterize the structure of $\mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}\mathfrak{g}$ and give an application for the isomorphism problem between modular Lie superalgebras of Cartan type.

For simplicity, we introduce some symbols. Let $(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k)$ be a k-tuple of arbitrary positive integers. As in usual, put

$$\mathrm{sgn}(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k) := \frac{\prod_{1 \leq j < l \leq k}(i_l - i_j)}{|\prod_{1 \leq j < l \leq k}(i_l - i_j)|},$$

which is ± 1. Write the integers

$$l_{\bar{0}}(\lambda, n) := \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathfrak{S}_0(\lambda, n) \\ n-k \text{ is even}}} \binom{n}{k} + \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda, n) \\ n-k \text{ is odd}}} \binom{n}{k},$$

$$l_{\bar{1}}(\lambda, n) := \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathfrak{S}_0(\lambda, n) \\ n-k \text{ is odd}}} \binom{n}{k} + \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda, n) \\ n-k \text{ is even}}} \binom{n}{k}.$$

Here we recall that for $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$,

$$\mathfrak{S}_l(\lambda, n) := \{k \in \overline{0,n} \mid n\lambda - n + 2k + l = 0 \in \mathbb{F}\}.$$

Let $V := V_{\bar{0}} \oplus V_{\bar{1}}$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded vector space where

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_{\bar{0}} := V_{00} \oplus V_{01} \oplus V_{02} \oplus V_{03},\ V_{03} := \delta'_{n\lambda,-1}\mathbb{F} \cdot 1,\ V_{\bar{1}} := V_{11} \oplus V_{12};\\
&V_{01} := \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{X_{i_1,\dots,i_r} \mid r \in \mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda, n), (i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \mathbf{J}(r), n - r \text{ is odd}\};\\
&V_{02} := \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{Y_{j_1,\dots,j_l} \mid l \in \mathfrak{S}_0(\lambda, n), (j_1, \dots, j_l) \in \mathbf{J}(l), n - l \text{ is even}\};\\
&V_{11} := \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{X_{i_1,\dots,i_r} \mid r \in \mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda, n), (i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \mathbf{J}(r), n - r \text{ is even}\};\\
&V_{12} := \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{Y_{j_1,\dots,j_l} \mid l \in \mathfrak{S}_0(\lambda, n), (j_1, \dots, j_l) \in \mathbf{J}(l), n - l \text{ is odd}\};\\
&\dim V_{00} = |t| - n,\ \dim V_{01} \oplus V_{02} = l_{\bar{0}}(n, \lambda),\ \dim V_{\bar{1}} = l_{\bar{1}}(n, \lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that V is of dimension

$$l_{\bar{0}}(\lambda, n) + l_{\bar{1}}(\lambda, n) + |t| - n + \delta'_{n\lambda,-1}.$$

Moreover,V becomes a Lie superalgebra by letting

$$[V_{00}, V] = [V_{03}, V] = [V_{01} + V_{11}, V_{01} + V_{11}] = [V_{02} + V_{12}, V_{02} + V_{12}] = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
[X_{i_1,\dots,i_r}, Y_{j_1,\dots,j_l}] &= (-1)^{r(n-r+1)}[Y_{j_1,\dots,j_l}, X_{i_1,\dots,i_r}]\\
&= \begin{cases} 0, & (i_1, \dots, i_r) \neq (j_{l+1}, \dots, j_n)\\ \delta'_{n\lambda,-1}\mathrm{sgn}(i'_{r+1}, \dots, i'_n, i'_2, \dots, i'_r)1, & (i_1, \dots, i_r) = (j_{l+1}, \dots, j_n). \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $\delta'_{n\lambda,-1} = 0$ then V is an abelian Lie algebra.

Let $f \in \mathrm{End}V$ be such that $f|_{V_{00}} = 0$, $f|_{V_{01}\oplus V_{02}\oplus V_{\bar{1}}} = \mathrm{id}_{V_{01}\oplus V_{02}\oplus V_{\bar{1}}}$ and $f|_{V_{03}} = 2\mathrm{id}_{V_{03}}$. Denote the semidirect product by $\mathfrak{L} := \mathbb{F}f \ltimes V$. Then $\mathfrak{L}$ is a Lie superalgebra of dimension $l_{\bar{0}}(\lambda, n) + l_{\bar{1}}(\lambda, n) + |t| - n + 1 + \delta'_{n\lambda,-1}$. Consider the centralizer of $\mathfrak{g}$ in KO,

$$C_{KO}(\mathfrak{g}) := \big\{e \in KO \mid [e, \mathfrak{g}] = 0\big\}.$$

Lemma 5.1. $C_{KO}(\mathfrak{g}) = 0$.

Proof. Let f be an arbitrary element of $C_{KO}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $f = f_0x_{2n+1} + f_1$ be the x_{2n+1}-decomposition. Note that $\mathfrak{g}$ contains 1, x_i for $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$ and $x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_1x_{1'}$. We have $f_0 = 0$ since $2f_0 = [f, 1] = 0$. Similarly, one gets $f \in \mathbb{F}$ from the equation that $[f, x_i] = 0$ for $i \in \overline{1, 2n}$. Since $-2f = [f, x_{2n+1} + n\lambda x_1x_{1'}] = 0$, we have $f = 0$. □

Theorem 5.2. $\mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{L}$ *and*

$$\dim \mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}\mathfrak{g} = \sum_{k\in\mathfrak{S}_0(\lambda,n)} \binom{n}{k} + \sum_{k\in\mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda,n)} \binom{n}{k} + |t| - n + 1 + \delta'_{n\lambda,-1}.$$

Proof. Let $\rho : \mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}\mathfrak{g} := \mathrm{Der}\mathfrak{g}/\mathrm{ad}\mathfrak{g}$ be the canonical homomorphism. By Theorem 4.15, $\mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}\mathfrak{g}$ is spanned by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{\rho(\mathrm{ad}X(i_1, \dots, i_r)) \mid r \in \mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda, n), (i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \mathbf{J}(r)\} \cup \{\rho(\mathrm{ad}y) \mid y \in S_5\} \cup \{\rho(\mathrm{ad}x_1x_{1'})\}\\
&\cup\{\rho(\partial_i^{p^{d_i}}) \mid 1 \le d_i \le t_i - 1, i \in \overline{1, n}\} \cup \{\delta'_{n\lambda,-1}\rho(\mathrm{ad}G)\}. \qquad (5.1)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{\rho(\partial_i^{p^{d_i}}) \mid 1 \leq d_i \leq t_i - 1, i \in \overline{1,n}\} \cap \rho(\mathrm{ad}\mathfrak{g}'') = 0$ and $\mathbb{F}(\rho(\mathrm{ad}x_1x_{1'})) \cap \rho(\mathrm{ad}\mathfrak{g}'') = 0$. We may prove from Lemma 5.1 that the above set (5.1) is $\mathbb{F}$-linearly independent. Suppose

$$a \in \{X(i_1, \ldots, i_r) \mid r \in \mathfrak{S}_2(\lambda, n), (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in \mathbf{J}(r)\} \cup S_5.$$

For $i, j \in \overline{1,n}$, $1 \leq d_i \leq t_i - 1$, $1 \leq d_j \leq t_j - 1$, $(i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in \mathbf{J}(r)$ and $(j_1, \ldots, j_l) \in \mathbf{J}(l)$, we have

$$\begin{array}{rl} & [\rho(\mathrm{ad}x_1x_{1'}), \rho(\mathrm{ad}a)] = \rho(\mathrm{ad}a), \\ & [\rho(\mathrm{ad}x_1x_{1'}), \rho(\mathrm{ad}G)] = 2\rho(\mathrm{ad}G), \\ & [\rho(\partial_i^{p^{d_i}}), \rho(\mathrm{Der}(\mathfrak{g}))] = [\rho(\mathrm{ad}S_5), \rho(\mathrm{ad}S_5)] = 0, \\ & [\rho(\mathrm{ad}a), \rho(\mathrm{ad}G)] = [\rho(\mathrm{ad}X(i_1, \ldots, i_r), \rho(\mathrm{ad}X(j_i, \ldots, j_l))] = 0, \\ & [\rho(\mathrm{ad}X(i_1, \ldots, i_r)), \rho(\mathrm{ad}E(\pi_{j_1} + \cdots + \pi_{j_l}, \langle j'_{l+1}, \ldots, j'_n\rangle, 2n+1))] \\ = & (-1)^{r(n-r+1)}[\rho(\mathrm{ad}E(\pi_{j_1} + \cdots + \pi_{j_l}, \langle j'_{l+1}, \ldots, j'_n\rangle, 2n+1)), \rho(\mathrm{ad}X(i_1, \ldots, i_r))] \\ = & \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0, & (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \neq (j_{l+1}, \ldots, j_n) \\ \delta'_{n\lambda,-1}\mathrm{sgn}(i'_{r+1}, \ldots, i'_n, i'_2, \ldots, i'_r)\rho(\mathrm{ad}G), & (i_1, \ldots, i_r) = (j_{l+1}, \ldots, j_n). \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

Now one may easily establish a Lie superalgebra isomorphism of $\mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}\mathfrak{g}$ onto $\mathfrak{L}$. The dimension formula follows. □

Corollary 5.3. *$SKO(p+2, p+3; (p-1)/2, \underline{r})$ is not isomorphic to $S(m, n; \underline{t})$, $HO(m, m; \underline{t})$ or $K(m, n; \underline{t})$ for any $m, n > 2$, $\underline{r} \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}$ and $\underline{t} \in \mathbb{N}^m$.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.2, [8, Theorems 2.12 and 2.4(ii)] and [9, Theorem 22], one sees that

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}S(m, n; \underline{t}) \ncong \mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}SKO(p+2, p+3; (p-1)/2, \underline{r}), \\ \mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}HO(m, m; \underline{t}) \ncong \mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}SKO(p+2, p+3; (p-1)/2, \underline{r}), \\ \mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}K(m, n; \underline{t}) \ncong \mathrm{Der}_{\mathrm{out}}SKO(p+2, p+3; (p-1)/2, \underline{r}) \end{array}$$

for all $m, n > 2$, $\underline{r} \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}$ and $\underline{t} \in \mathbb{N}^m$. Therefore, $SKO(p+2, p+3; (p-1)/2, \underline{r})$ is not isomorphic to $S(m, n; \underline{t})$, $HO(m, m; \underline{t})$ and $K(m, n; \underline{t})$ for any $m, n > 2$, $\underline{r} \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}$ and $\underline{t} \in \mathbb{N}^m$. □

Remark 5.4. *By Corollaries 3.4 and 5.3, the family of finite dimensional simple special odd contact superalgebras does contain "strange" ones which are not isomorphic to any simple Lie superalgebras of Cartan type W, S, H, K, HO, KO or SHO. A complete consideration for the isomorphism problem between modular Lie superalgebras of Cartan type is beyond the scope of the present paper.*

References

[1] S. Bouarroudj and D. Leites. Simple Lie superalgebras and nonintegrable distributions in characteristic *p*. *J. Math. Sci.* **141**(4) (2007): 1390-1398.

[2] A. Elduque. New simple Lie superalgebras in characteristic 3. *J. Algebra* **296**(1) (2006): 196–233.

[3] J.-Y. Fu, Q.-C. Zhang, and C.-P. Jiang. The Cartan-type modular Lie superalgebra *KO*. *Commun. Algebra* **34**(1) (2006): 107–128.

[4] V. G. Kac. Lie superalgebras. *Adv. Math.* **26** (1977): 8–96.

[5] V. G. Kac. Classification of infinite dimensional simple linearly compact Lie superalgebras. *Adv. Math.* **139** (1998): 1–55.

[6] Yu. Kochetkov and D. Leites. Simple Lie algebras in characteristic 2 recovered from superalgebras and on the notion of a simple finite group. Proc. International Conference on Algebra (Novosibirsk, 1989), *Contemp. Math.*, 131, Part 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1992, pp. 59–67.

[7] W.-D. Liu and Y.-H. He. Finite-dimensional special odd Hamiltonian superalgebras in prime characteristic. *Commun. Contemp. Math.* (to appear).

[8] W.-D. Liu and Y.-Z. Zhang. The outer derivation algebras of finite dimensional Cartan-type modular Lie superalgebras. *Commun. Algebra*, **33**(7) (2005): 2131–2146.

[9] W.-D. Liu, Y.-Z. Zhang, and X.-L. Wang. The derivation algebra of the Cartan-type Lie superalgebra HO. *J. Algebra* **273** (2004): 176-205.

[10] V. M. Petrogradski. Identities in the enveloping algebras for modular Lie superalgebras. *J. Algebra* **145** (1992): 1–21.

[11] M. Scheunert. *Theory of Lie superalgebras*. Lecture Notes in Math. 716. Springer-verlag, 1979.

[12] H. Strade. *Simple Lie algebras over fields of positive characteristic, I. Structure theory.* Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 2004.

[13] H. Strade and R. Farnsteiner. *Modular Lie Algebras and Their Representations*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 116, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1988.

[14] Y. Wang and Y.-Z. Zhang. Derivation algebra $\mathrm{Der}(H)$ and central extensions of Lie superalgebras. *Commun. Algebra* **32** (2004): 4117–4131.

[15] Y.-Z. Zhang. Finite-dimensonal Lie superalgebras of Catan-type over a field of prime characteristic. *Chin. Sci. Bull.* **42** (1997): 720–724.

[16] Q.-C. Zhang and Y.-Z. Zhang. Derivation algebras of modular Lie superalgebras W and S of Cartan-type. *Acta Math. Sci.* **20**(1) (2000): 137–144.